DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 494 PS 009 730

AUTHOR Takanishi, Ruby, Ed.
TITLE Public Policy for Children and Families: Who Shall Decide? Report No. 3.
SPONS AGENCY National Academy of Education, Syracuse, N.Y.; National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.
PUB DATE Aug 77
GRANT NIMH-MH-12924-06
NOTE 58p.; Symposium presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (85th, San Francisco, California, August 26-30, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Advocacy; *Childhood Needs; Citizen Role; Family Programs; Government Role; Needs Assessment; Parent Participation; *Policy Formation; Program Coordination; *Psychologists; *Public Policy; Social Sciences; Symposia

ABSTRACT

This paper represents the proceedings of a symposium concerned with public policy for children and families. The opening remarks by the chairperson address procedural questions of who should be involved in the formation of policies affecting children and families, when they should be involved and for what content. Specific presentations include (1) psychological perspectives of child advocacy, (2) considerations of children's needs in policy formation, from a practitioner's perspective and (3) the role of citizens and parents in policy formation and program implementation. The presentation of the first symposium discussant focuses on the need for an intermediary process for improving communication and understanding between public policy makers on the one hand and researchers, practitioners, children and families on the other. The second discussant focuses on ways in which psychologists as individuals and through professional organizations can affect public policy. Current legislation related to child advocacy is also discussed in this presentation. The closing reflections on the symposium by the chairperson summarize the issues discussed and present further ideas on the role of social scientists in policy formation. (BD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148494

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PUBLIC POLICY FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES:

WHO SHALL DECIDE?

Ruby Takanishi, Editor

University of California, Los Angeles

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ruby Takanishi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Report No. 3, 1977

PS 009780

This symposium was sponsored by Divisions 9 (Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues), 7, and 35, and the American Psychological Association Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility for Psychologists, at the 1977 American Psychological Association Annual Convention in San Francisco.

Publication of this collection of papers was supported by Grant No. MH12924-06 from the National Institute of Mental Health, Professor Norma Deitch Feshbach, Training Director. The assistance of Norma Deitch Feshbach and Maryalice Jordan-Marsh in preparing this report is gratefully acknowledged. Partial support of the editor's work was provided by the National Academy of Education.

CONTENTS

Chair's Remarks

Posing the Problem 1
Ruby Takanishi

Panelists' Presentations

Public Policy for Children: A Psychological Perspective . . . 5
Seymour Feshbach
Norma Deitch Feshbach

Grounding Policy in Children's Needs: A Practitioner's Perspective 14
Docia Zavitkovsky

Citizen and Parent Participation in Policy Making and Program Implementation 20
Karen Hill-Scott

Discussants' Remarks

Toward Influencing Those Who Make Public Policy for Children and Families: A Liaison Strategy 29
Paul R. Dokecki

Psychologists and Public Policy or Making the Most of the Washington Situation 39
William Bevan

Reflections on the Symposium

The Role of the Social Scientists in Policy Formation 48
Ruby Takanishi

Posing the Problem

Ruby Takanishi
University of California, Los Angeles

The idea for this symposium originated in concerns about the multitude of professional, community, and child advocacy groups that are attempting to influence American public policy toward children and their families. These groups are largely uncoordinated and often in competition for limited programmatic funds. Public policy in this area can be said to be either nonexistent or a nightmare of fragmentation, overlaps, and gaps (LaCrosse & Andersen, 1977). An important issue at this juncture is a fundamentally political one: Who shall define and control what policy should be? In this symposium we will attempt to address procedural questions of who should be involved in the policy-making process, at what points, and over what content.

Why is the question of the roles of various constituencies in the policy-making process so critical? The identification of a policy's relevant public is defined partially by the political and moral contexts in which policy decisions are made and implemented (Kerr, 1976). These matrices are determined by the values and the interests of individuals who are involved in making decisions.

The political theory of participatory democracy calls for the involvement of the people who will be the so-called "targets" of the policy. Integral to this idea, public policy should be based on the needs of the people affected and not on the needs of the professional and administrative groups that serve them (LaCrosse & Andersen, 1977). Although this appears to us in 1977 as a truism, it is still the case that in formulating policy regarding children and families, we have attempted to learn very little about what children and families actually regard as important and desirable components of a public policy. What we see most often are "model" families constructed from statistics and polls, i.e., policy-created families, not real children and families.

A good example of how the lack of "grass-roots" involvement affects policy formation is found in one California community where a group of professionals and students who were working on policy issues met with parents to identify their perceptions of what should be included in a public policy for children and families. It soon became clear that an important issue around which there was considerable concern and activity, especially among single parents, was fair housing for children. As far as I know, no national policy-making body has dealt with this issue involving discrimination against children in housing.

Another related issue within the political context is the question of who defines what areas of child and family life should be part of a public policy to begin with. This is important because the definition of a problem leads to needs; needs create professional specialties and administrative structures to deal with these needs (Hobbs, 1975); and the allocation of resources in human services is consequently affected.

Thus as professionals become more interested, involved, and organized around questions of social policy, there are issues of professional autonomy, self-interest, and image building involved. Is it possible that issues such as fair housing for children are neglected because there are no "fair housing professionals"?

The question of who should decide is also posed within a moral context, that is, a system or multiple systems of strongly held values and beliefs about what is good and just. A unique aspect of policy in this area is that Americans have traditionally placed--and show little sign of changing--high values on the privacy and sanctity of the family unit. Recent attempts to pass legislation in children's programs at the federal level have indicated that it will be difficult to develop public policy without identifying both the diversity of values regarding children and family life and the diversity of family forms, and taking them into account. The only way to forge any synthesis of popular and professional values is through vigorous public participation and debate. To develop professional, community, and parent coalitions around issues is a monumental task, and when it is accomplished it can erode quickly without widespread public support and understanding (Steiner, 1976).

We have, in the past, focused largely on questions of GOALS for public policy regarding children and families (see, for example, Keniston, et al., 1977; National Academy of Sciences, 1976), but I believe that a prior question is who--individuals and groups--should be involved in the identification of public policy goals. This question is particularly important when policy impinges on such a myth and ideologically laden area as American families (Daedalus, 1977; Keniston, et al., 1977). Until we deal with this procedural question, we will continue to proliferate policy statements which do not have the support necessary for the legislation and implementation of the policies. There are difficult strategical problems in involving constituencies and getting them to work together, and this must be acknowledged. But the benefits of a policy based on the involvement of all relevant constituencies would be great.

One assumption underlying the selection of the symposium participants is that individuals with different experiences, training, professional affiliations, and roles will approach a specific question in divergent ways. Thus, multiple forms and understandings of reality should emerge from their presentations. This arrangement is not merely an intellectual exercise, but an illustration of the multiple realities with which a larger group of participants might approach public policy issues. These presentations will capture the complexity of both the procedural and substantive issues which lie before us. The participants include a lawyer, two psychologists, an administrator, and a planner working with community people.

JOHN E. COONS[1] of the Child and Government Project in the School of Law at the University of California, Berkeley, will begin by

[1]Professor Coons decided not to submit a paper for this collection. Some of his remarks are presented in the chair's reflections on the symposium.

presenting a set of principles for choosing who gets to decide in public policy affecting young children. Professor Coons is particularly interested in a theory of decision making in this area, and has been working on a book with Stephen Sugerman on families as primary decision makers in education.

SEYMOUR FESHBACH, chair of the Department of Psychology at the University of California, Los Angeles, and NORMA DEITCH FESHBACH, Professor of Education and Psychology at UCLA, and former chair of the American Psychological Association Task Force on the Rights of Children and Youth, will consider the political, social-psychological, and professional issues entailed in psychologists functioning as experts and/or as child advocates. They argue for widening the participation of psychological experts, including researchers and practitioners, in public policy formation.

DOCIA ZAVITKOVSKY is Director of the Santa Monica Children's Centers, a nationally recognized program of comprehensive child development services provided in a public school district, and was the sole practitioner--that is, one having daily contact with children and families--on the Advisory Committee on Child Development of the National Academy of Sciences. She will discuss the role of various constituencies from the vantage point of an administrator and child advocate who has participated in the long struggle to establish publicly supported child development programs in California.

KAREN HILL-SCOTT, Assistant Professor in the School of Architecture and Urban Planning, UCLA, and Program Director, Child Care Referral Service for the Joint Center for Community Studies, will talk about her experiences in involving community individuals in planning and implementing child development programs. Professor Scott worked with a group of community individuals in Los Angeles for over three years to plan a curriculum and training program for the Tillmon Child Development Center at the King-Drew Medical Complex.

The discussants will be WILLIAM BEVAN of the Department of Psychology and Director of the Roundtable for Science and Public Policy at Duke University, and PAUL DOKECKI of George Peabody College and the Center for the Study of Families, Institute for Public Policy Studies at Vanderbilt University. Both have been deeply involved in questions related to the interface of social science and social policy.

References

The family. Daedalus, 1977, 106(2).

Hobbs, N. (Ed.). The futures of children: Categories, labels, and their consequences. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Keniston, K., et al. All our children: The American family under pressure. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

Kerr, D. H. Educational policy: Analysis, structure, and justification. New York: David McKay, 1976.

LaCrosse, E. R., & Andersen, C. From policy to priority to program: An inquiry into the structure and development of a national social policy for children and families. Presented at the Interdisciplinary Institute in Early Childhood, Center for Early Education and Development, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota, May 20 & 21, 1977.

National Academy of Sciences. Toward a national policy for children and families. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976.

Steiner, G. A. The children's cause. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1976.

Public Policy for Children: A Psychological Perspective

Seymour Feshbach and Norma Deitch Feshbach
University of California, Los Angeles

A marked feature of sociopolitical activity in recent years has been the effort to foster the legal, political, and social-psychological status of various groups that have, historically, been disenfranchised, discriminated against, and denied their legitimate rights. The heightened consciousness regarding ethnic minorities and women has been extended to include children. This increased awareness of children's rights is one factor contributing to contemporary ferment regarding public policies for children (Feshbach & Feshbach, Note 1). An even more salient factor has been the federal investment in educational, health, and welfare programs designed to meet the needs of various groups of children during the past two decades. Further, changes in the social structure such as the increasing proportion of single mothers and women in the labor market have created additional pressures for federal support for early caregiving and early educational resources for young children. Psychologists have become centrally involved in these social and educational issues in several different capacities--as developers and as evaluators of programs, as experts testifying on the efficacy of various procedures and programs, and as advocates for children.

However, the entrance of psychologists into the decision-making arena of public policy affecting children, despite its importance and necessity, cannot be described as a harmonious procession. The marchers, to extend the metaphor, are frequently out of step and occasionally even trip each other; some feel they have earned, or perhaps inherited, the prerogative of leading the parade while others are attempting to challenge the self-appointed drum majors and majorettes. Further, there are still many who are not only reluctant to enter the procession but who are engaged in vigorous efforts to discourage others from participation. The conflict, confusion, and cacophony that, in our opinion, characterizes our discipline's current posture regarding the role of policy does not serve the best interests of psychology. More important, it does not serve the best interests of children and their families.

It is the thesis of this paper that the formulation of public policy affecting children requires the participation of a wide spectrum of psychological experts. The latter should include both the basic researcher and the applied practitioner, each of whom has something important to contribute to this discussion. Psychologists may contribute to policy analysis and debate in the role of expert or as advocate. We shall consider the importance of distinguishing between these roles, while being particularly careful to avoid equating vigor of advocacy with certainty of scientific judgment. However, it is our contention that in the last analysis, all psychologists working with children have

---

The authors express appreciation to Ruby Takanishi and Michael Campbell for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

the responsibility of functioning as advocates for children. Both children and the profession will benefit from this process--children, through the articulation of their needs and efforts in their behalf by professionals, and the latter, through the sharpening of values and the interchange of diverse views that policy analysis entails.

There are many questions that can be raised in regard to the psychologist's role in the area of public policy for children. We shall focus on two issues: the first is addressed to a clarification of roles--of the psychologist as expert, as advocate, and as a participant in policy analysis and policy making. The second is concerned with a consideration of who shall function as an expert and/or as an advocate, and the mechanism by which the views of psychologists can be most effectively formulated and expressed.

The diverse roles that psychologists assume in the public policy process--as experts, as advocates, as policy participants, are all clearly related. Nevertheless, there are important distinctions among them, distinctions that when ignored may confuse the public and create problems for the profession. The role of "expert" is a technical one, drawing upon the specialized training and experiences that define the profession. The psychologist's knowledge of relevant research literature, methodological sophistication and clinical and related competencies, provide the ingredients of his or her "expertise." These skills are used for evaluative purposes when the psychologist is called upon to function in the role of expert. The evaluation may range from appraising the research literature pertinent to some issue affecting children, and assessing the likely utility of a proposed procedure for achieving a particular behavioral goal, to suggesting a recommended course of action.

The psychologist as advocate, in contrast to the expert role, may be conceptualized as an effort extended by a professional in behalf of particular needs of children or an effort to realize particular values that affect children. While the two roles may overlap in some ways, they differ in several functionally significant respects. The expert, traditionally, is reactive, being typically called upon to render a judgment. The advocate, however, is engaged in the active pursuit or defense of a program believed to be in the interests of children. Thus, psychologists engaged in the effort to eliminate the use of corporal punishment in public schools have sought out opportunities to testify, have disseminated, through articles and public addresses, the arguments against the use of corporal punishment and have promulgated alternative modes of discipline and behavior control (N. Feshbach, et al., Note 2). However, some experts, concerned about the degree of scientific support for alleged deleterious consequences of corporal punishment, have been loath to commit themselves in regard to this issue.

Experts, with some unfortunate exceptions, in general, remain close to the theoretical and empirical bases for their judgments; probabilities and qualifications are attached to their statements. Advocates, while possibly remaining close to their data base, have chosen a course of action. In the expert role, the evidentiary status

of a proposition is primary. In the advocacy role, the needs of children, and other groups as well, assume a higher position in the value hierarchy.

Unfortunately, role behavior in the real world is complex and does not neatly accord with the distinctions that have been made. Some advocates function primarily as experts restricting their advocacy role to a review of the evidence supporting a particular policy position. Some experts may become very active in their opposition to advocacy, so much so that they are essentially functioning as advocates. Thus "experts" who may actively campaign to block the American Psychological Association from taking a position on the use of corporal punishment in the schools are implicitly adopting an advocacy role in support of the status quo. Whether or not their advocacy is based upon the belief that the scientific evidence does not warrant a change in this particular social policy or the belief that the elimination of caning in British schools is a symptom, if not the cause, of Britain's economic and political decline, the effect is the same: support of current institutional practices in regard to corporal punishment. In brief, we cannot eschew the advocacy role. This is a matter that will be considered again at the conclusion of this paper.

To illustrate further differences between the expert and advocate roles, it is useful to examine these roles in the context of a broad policy issue such as federal subsidy of day care centers. The adoption of such a program entails a number of considerations--political, economic, social, educational, and psychological; and the policy maker draws upon experts from all of these areas to arrive at a decision. Within the educational-psychological domain, there are a variety of questions concerning which expert evaluations and inferences are pertinent. What are the developmental effects of participation in day care programs? Are these effects short-lived or enduring? How does such participation by the child affect the family structure, particularly the child's relationship with the other family members? What are the differences in the pattern of the child's development between participation in day care centers, versus attendance at a family day care home, or being raised at home by a single parent who does not work, or being raised in an intact two parent family structure? What are the alternatives for the single parent who must work? What are the psychological effects of not providing day care on the caregiver? These questions are not exhaustive or sufficient. A statement of effects without a specification of conditions is only half an answer; and in this case, half may be worse than none. Thus, we would want to know whether variations in day care centers result in substantial differences in developmental outcomes. Can we specify the properties of a quality day care program and formulate minimal and ideal standards? Are there significant individual differences in the effects of day care? Can we, or perhaps more to the point, need we identify children for whom day care is an undesirable alternative? And there are, of course, still other variables, pertaining to personnel requirements, training, local autonomy, and so on, that need to be evaluated by the psychologist.

In responding to these questions, the expert draws upon two primary sources of data--that provided by research findings and that

provided by professional observations. We wish to emphasize the point that the observations gathered in the course of professional experience as well as the observations obtained in the course of scientific studies are relevant to the formulation of expert judgments. In regard to the day care issue, professional observations may be usefully divided into two subsets, those based on the actual involvement in the management of day care centers and those obtained in the course of clinical practice. As a rule, each of these data sources will be represented by different groups of experts, and while there may be concurrence among all these types of experts, differences in evaluations are much more likely to be the case. For the researcher, the effects and desirability of day care is an open question to be resolved by the verdict of the findings. The major problem usually confronting these experts is a gap between the available research and the specific question at issue. Unfortunately, definitive studies are rarely at hand, and the scientists' statements concerning the effects of day care and relevant parameters must be qualified. However, there is striking variation among researchers as to the degree of evidence they may require to make an assertion at a high level of confidence, and as to their willingness to bridge the gap between a modest data base and an important social judgment. This is not to say that scientists should not proffer evaluations regarding day care or other issues of moment but in doing so, the cautions and caveats that our limited knowledge occasions should be detailed.

Professional practitioners, in contrast, can be more confident in their assertions inasmuch as their evaluations, while subjective, carry no pretension beyond the range of their ability and experience. They do not speak in the name of Science, a mantle that elicits an aura of impersonal objectivity and established fact. The frame of reference of the professional directly involved in day care also differs from that of the researcher. The former, in a very real sense, has already made a commitment to propositions about which the researcher may be uncertain. Thus, in general, professionals involved in day care are likely to believe in the positive value of day care for the young child. If day care were harmful to children or ineffective, they would presumably be engaged in some other activity. Their concerns are much more likely to be with the type of day care program and mode of support rather than with the value of day care as such. The scientist-expert may take the position that individually based professional judgments are an unreliable data source and ought not enter into the decision-making process. This is a cavalier, although not uncommon, position in matters regarding children.

The issue of the relative weights of scientific versus other professional judgments in the evaluation of day care, or Head Start, or parent training, is a complex one that warrants more exhaustive analysis than the time limits of this paper permit. For our purposes, it is pertinent to note that one important parameter is the adequacy of the research assessment--that is, the validity of the measures, the procedures, the comprehensiveness of the evaluation, the degree of replicability of research findings, the degree of inference required and so on. Another parameter is the extent of professional experience with varying types of day care models and varying populations.

Judgments from another data source--experience derived from clinical samples, are in this instance unreliable. An observation that a youngster who attended a day care center has behavior problems or that some children have emotional disturbances that may be related to day care placement provides no basis for a generalized judgment about day care. Moreover, conclusions based on untested clinical theory--e.g., it is harmful to maintain children in day care centers because they will be deprived of maternal gratification of basic nurturance needs, are no more than speculation and do not carry the same status as research findings or direct day care observations. It may be noted that the clinician's perspective, qua clinician, no less than the researcher's perspective and the practitioner's perspective, disposes the expert toward a particular judgment. In general, the clinician tends to be disposed toward a negative evaluation, the day care practitioner toward a positive evaluation, and the researcher toward a skeptical evaluation.

The differing perspectives of the researcher and the practitioner, when taken conjointly, provide a useful balance in the determination of public policy. A practitioner's commitment toward a particular program can be tempered and balanced by the researcher's systematic evaluation of that program. Conversely, the researcher's evaluation can be tempered and balanced by the clinician's experience. Policy issues in regard to compensatory education are a case in point. The extensive evaluation of federal funding of a number of compensatory education programs has resulted in serious questioning as to whether these funds are accomplishing the objectives for which they were intended, despite the enthusiasm of many practitioners for these programs. At the same time, the experience and perspective of the practitioner has helped temper the negative conclusions drawn by some researchers. For example, practitioners' experiences with compensatory educational programs helped balance the sweeping pessimistic generalizations and the unwarranted genetic inferences made by Jensen (1969) in his provocative Harvard Educational Review paper. These latter observations are particularly important to consider in formulating public policy, given the fact that the evaluation data used by Jensen were largely based on programs that took many different forms, had been in effect short periods of time, many for a year or less, and were administered with varying degrees of efficiency and enthusiasm.

In addition, the differing perspectives provided by the researcher and the practioner have different relationships to the advocacy role. Professional practice implicitly entails a form of advocacy. The professional involved in day care is an advocate of day care for children although possibly not an advocate of federal subsidization of day care. One might expect, then, that practitioners will recognize the need for and participate in child advocacy programs at a much earlier point than the researcher concerned with child development. Thus, it has been the professional practitioners, plus a sprinkling of researchers with professional backgrounds, who have been in the vanguard of the struggle to eliminate corporal punishment in educational institutions, to develop programs to counteract child abuse, to augment mental health research for children, and to expand the scope of day care and other early childhood facilities. The initial differences in entry into the

advocacy role make some tension between the researcher and the practitioner almost inevitable, a tension that becomes exacerbated when a recent arrival to a child advocacy cause becomes a primary spokesperson in policy matters.

The process of advocacy, while a directed effort to change policy, should be distinguished from the more general role that psychologists could play in the formulation and implementation of policy. Policy analysis entails a consideration of alternatives, the potential benefits and costs for each alternative, and their associated probabilities, require specification. Moreover, some quantitative ordering of the costs and benefits, even if only on a nominal scale, is required. The question of who shall assign values to emotional costs, cognitive gains, financial expenditures, material welfare, political liability is a thorny one as is the problem of how it should be done. In essence, the reconciliation of conflicting values is the core of the political process. Whereas, adults may communicate their interests through political actions, children are not a potent constituency. Nor are very young children capable of cognizing their interests. It appears then, that children's interests require representation by other groups or individuals. Parents are, of course, the most important of these groups. Professionals constitute another group, their value attributions frequently, but not always, coinciding with those of parents.

The formulation of policy entails still another element that warrants comment, namely the analysis of the forces necessary to bring about and maintain a policy change. Thus, it is insufficient to decide that increased federal support of day care is desirable and to allocate funds for this purpose if one cannot insure that day care centers will maintain their vitality and effectiveness. Analogously, one might concur in a policy permitting the use of aversive procedures to modify the behavior of seriously disturbed children engaged in self-destructive actions. However, if one could not control the spread of aversive methods of behavior control to a wider array of children, or the use of these aversive procedures as punishment for deviations from prescribed behaviors, then the adoption of the policy will have proved to have been counterproductive. In short, policy formulation and research entail a comprehensive analysis of options and their consequences. The policy maker should have a systems orientation, sensitive to the ripples and countercurrents that adoption of a particular policy might initiate. Therefore, policy research, whether carried out by a psychologist or another professional, must be, to quote Etzioni (1971), "inevitably critical."

Advocacy may constitute the outcome of a particular policy analysis but not necessarily. Advocacy can be more fruitfully conceived as the expression of a particular interest group. Since the interest group with which we are concerned consists of children who cannot articulate and act in an organized manner on their interests, we believe that it is entirely proper that psychologists--whether investigators or practitioners, also function in an advocacy role.

Individuals whose profession is intimately linked to children--research scientists, clinicians, educators, pediatricians, probation

officers--the list is long and should, of course, include parents--have a special responsibility toward children. Many derive their livelihood from work with children by observing them, writing about the, or through lecturing about them; and for this reason, if for no other, have an obligation to represent the best interests of children, however one defines "best interests." In using words such as "obligations" and "responsibility," one runs the risk of appearing moralistic, even patronizing. However, we would suggest that the "ought" implied in these phrases does not derive from the invocation of a "superego-type" structure, but rather is based upon a clarification of the dimensions and ramifications of a professional role that entails involvement with children. There is extant a view of this professional role that encourages dissociation from involvement in the representing of children's interests and in the real world of policy and politics. However, we are asserting that by virture of their professional activities in studying and working with children and their families, psychologists have also acquired the role of being one of the spokespersons for children.

At this point, we turn to the second principal issue to which this paper is addressed--namely, the mechanism for participation of psychologists as advocates and as experts in furthering the best interests of children. Another way of phrasing this issue is to ask, who shall be the expert and child advocate? There is, of course, the obvious distinction between individuals who speak for themselves and individuals who speak for the profession. Any psychologist can presumably speak for him/herself in support of a value affecting children. The interesting question is how the profession can arrive at agreement regarding evaluation of instrumentalities, and articulation of children's needs, and how it can best represent agreement and differences in views, when the latter exist, as they so often do, in the implementation of public policy for children.

In stating the question in this form, it is clear that we are expressing some dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs with respect to the participation of psychologists in the formulation of public policy that affects children. From our perspective, the role that psychology and psychologists have played in the social policy arena has frequently been idiosyncratic, haphazard, and often fortuitous. In addition, as has been indicated earlier, participation in the policy process has been characterized by tension between the "experts" and "advocates" and also by ambivalence, especially on the part of scientist-experts. Many of the latter often, and appropriately, have serious reservations about extrapolating from available data to complex social propositions. As a consequence, they question the legitimacy of psychologists leaving the world of scientific journals and monographs and engaging in the world of social policy. Other researchers, given the same data base, have no hesitation in asserting "scientific" justification for a major social policy position. Still other researchers, perhaps reluctantly, assume the mantle of social responsibility and act as spokespeople for the scientific professional, with the implicit assumption of the irrelevancy of the wealth of practitioner observations.

As a consequence, when not haphazard, the participation of psychologists in the policy process has been elitist and restrictive. We

recognize that scientific issues cannot be resolved by a democratic vote. At the same time, it must also be recognized that consensus among investigators plays an important role in the scientific process of winnowing fact from fiction. In addition, and most important, the current state of knowledge regarding the development of the child allows for very little expression of scientific certainties. Under these circumstances, the judgments of many psychologists, including practitioners, become pertinent. A mechanism is needed that would facilitate the participation of the psychological community the the policy-making process and that would provide a conduit to the policy makers for the transmission of professional judgments regarding policy issues pertaining to children. One of the important consequences of such an endeavor is that differing values, as well as differing interpretations of extant data, would be communicated. Given the state of scientific and clinical knowledge of children and their settings, and the low probability of definitive data in the very near future, values, explicit or implicit, inevitably enter into the evaluation process.

What is required then, is a structure by which all psychologists who deal with children have an opportunity to participate in the policy dialogue. The open workshops on social policy affecting children that were held just prior to the 1977 meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development are an example and a step in the direction we are advocating. However, convention participation is of necessity limited--limited in time and attendance. The Association for the Advancement of Psychology (AAP) provides a very useful forum for the interchange between psychology and legislatures. Psychologists have input into this interchange through their elected trustees, through volunteer activity and through survey responses. Organization at local levels of psychologists, with feedback of expert judgments and advocacy positions to AAP or a central APA (American Psychological Association) group, would provide the range of views required to arrive at representative judgments. Equally important, it would offer a mechanism by which psychologists can become involved in the current ferment of policy consideration affecting children.

Division 9 of APA, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI), has organized local chapters that concern themselves with a variety of local and national issues to which psychological knowledge is germane. The SPSSI model can be profitably extended to other divisions of APA that are concerned with children's issues. Each division might appoint a division level policy committee or might nominate members to a central APA committee. The function of this central committee would be to organize and summarize the statements received from local chapters. The APA central committee on children's policy would also distribute to the local committees a set of policy questions for their consideration. The latter, of course, need not restrict themselves solely to the indicated topics but could review other issues that have special local relevance. It is true that these local chapters might be made up of a potpourri of developmental psychologists who call themselves basic scientists, applied researchers, early childhood educators, clinicians, teachers, and administrators. However, whether or not the "melting-pot" theory will apply to this mix of populations, they have something to learn from each other, and our thinking and advocacy regarding policies affecting children should be the better for it.

In the last analysis, we are all advocates, either through conscious support of a particular policy or through passive inaction. Inasmuch as we are professionals who, through practice or research, are involved with children, a conscious and shared articulation and formulation of policy issues would seem the appropriate path to pursue.

Reference Notes

1. Feshbach, N., & Feshbach, S. (Eds.). Roles, rights and responsibilities of children: Past, present and future. Journal of Social Issues, in press.

2. Feshbach, N., et al. APA Task Force on the rights of children and youth. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1977.

References

Etzioni, A. Policy research. American Sociologist, 1971, 6, 8-12.

Jensen, A. R. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 39(1), 1-123.

Grounding Policy in Children's Needs: A Practitioner's Perspective

Docia Zavitkovsky
Santa Monica Unified School District

At every conference where the focus is on children and families, speakers, panelists, discussants, and participants run down the list of needs, theories, concerns, remedies, and solutions to the problems of the times. Still, when the conference closes the complex problems remain, no less complex and no less real because they have been dissected and labeled, and because they have been called complex. The basic urgency remains: Do something--do something about latch-key children, child abuse, nutrition, school lunch programs, child neglect, school dropouts, teenage pregnancy, prenatal care, infant and toddler care, child health programs, family day care, center day care, to name just a few. We all argree there should be action. The basic questions remain: What action shall we take? And who shall decide?

There are no easy answers, no magic wand to wave. If action matched rhetoric there would be no problem. We would have a national policy for children based on children's needs. We would be implementing the policy at the local level through community coordinated programs, and we would be spending our time today discussing how to improve and enrich programs and services.

Current policy formation for children occurs at levels farthest away from children and the people who have daily contact with children. An example of this is day care where policy is determined and funded at the national level, filters through the state and then to local agencies and practitioners where the children and their families experience the effect, intended and unintended, of public policy.

However, we know that children are human beings, not components who fit into programmatic categories of development, i.e., cognitive development, affective development, and social development. They are human beings, not commodities that can wait while Congress convenes or committees decide. They are human beings, not products to be shelved until we are ready to use them again; or poured into a mold to our liking nor streamlined for our use; or handled en masse nor fitted into a stereotyped pattern for blueprinting. And as human beings, their basic needs are health, nourishment, shelter, safety, love, warmth, a feeling of belonging, of being, of becoming.

So, let's start with the theory that there should be a policy for children because they are children, and that the policy should be grounded in their basic needs of health, safety, and well being, and not because mothers must be employed to lower the welfare rolls, and not because child care jobs will increase employment opportunities. I am convinced, after more than thirty years of working in the day care

---

The author expresses appreciation to Ruby Takanishi and Ann Zavitkovsky for their helpful comments.

field, that for policy to become a policy for children, the procedure for formulating it must become a two-way street and that people at the local level who know and understand children's needs, who are directly affected, and who are concerned about the quality of service, must have more say in determining what goes into local, state, and national policy, and more responsibility for defining and monitoring programs and services that implement that policy.

We must find better ways to work together in a coalition for children, to link elements together from all sources whether we are psychologists, social workers, manpower specialists, recreation leaders, health professionals, parents, or community volunteers; whether we provide services for children under public, voluntary, or proprietary auspices; and whether there are variations in the local, state, or federal policies under which we administer these services. We must find better ways to bring concerned community people together to examine values and goals, develop objectives, make recommendations for a plan of action and determine how best to get the message to public policy makers so that appropriate legislation can be enacted and committees can begin to implement needed programs and services. Imagine consumers, practitioners, and professionals coming together to write policy for children. It boggles the mind that people (parents are people too!) who have had first-hand experience with children would be the architects of policy.

This, of course, is no easy task. First, it is difficult to get professional consensus. Mondale (cited in Senn, 1977) suggests that "we should have them (the professionals) lock themselves in a room, resolve their differences and say, 'Here is our plan; we have designed it for kids, not for ourselves.'" Second, it is difficult to get people at the local community level to know, to understand, believe, and feel responsible so that they can communicate to the writers and implementers of policy what programs and services are necessary for children in their community. Third, it is difficult on the part of legislators and administrators to sort out or even hear the conflicting positions and major disagreements within the community. Fourth, it is difficult to present and explore complicated issues given the characteristics of our media--speed, simplification, sensationalism. Many of you will recall how the press used scare tactics in the last attempt to pass a national child development bill, calling it "a scheme for essentially Sovietizing American family life . . . which . . . would permit a legion of teachers, psychologists, and behavioral specialists to shape infants as clay," in centers characterized as "inventions of the devil."

Overcoming these barriers takes time, patience, tolerance, knowledge, flexibility, good health, and a sense of humor. That means that one can't sit complacently and wait for professional consensus to take place, for community people to become involved in a productive way, for legislators to support legislation which is good for children, and for the press to present all sides of the issues. Rather, it means that one must make a beginning--accepting reality with all of it's contradictions and imperfections, bringing concerned people together to examine the issues, determining a course of action, keeping the main goal in focus and remembering that conflict, uncertainty, and differences are not necessarily destructive but part of the process of growth.

For example, some 30 years ago in California when funds made available under the Lanham Community Facilities Act were to be withdrawn, which meant federal funds would not longer be available for child care centers, parents, representatives from organizations, agencies and institutions, and concerned citizens banded together and worked for legislation that would continue California Child Care Centers under state auspices and state funds. There was energy, enthusiasm, excitement, and meaningful communication to spare. There was a belief in and support of a common cause. There was determination that legislators should hear them and that favorable action would result even though they were so naive about the legislative process that when two of the parents from Santa Monica were sent to the Legislature as advocates they asked when they arrived at the capitol where they should go to register as agitators! That legislation was enacted that made it possible for centers to continue operating was due in large measure to the fact that people in communities all across the state were interested, concerned, and involved. They were able to define the problem, identify with it, invest something of themselves in solving it, and speak to legislators, forcefully and knowledgeably.

But this was only the beginning of the battle, for the State Legislature appropriated funds to keep the centers open for only a year and it was only through the continued efforts of concerned people that legislators were convinced that funds should be appropriated on a year-to-year basis, then on a two-year basis until in 1957 when child care centers, now the Children's Centers, became a permanent part of California's educational system. Elizabeth Prescott (1972), in Politics of Day Care, writes "these yearly battles produced a core of directors and dedicated parents who learned to organize and fight for what they wanted and created an esprit de corps not found in many publicly sponsored programs."

It would be naive, however, to think that the child care centers legislation was enacted because the primary concern of legislators was for the development and well-being of children. Historically, services have been provided because of social or economic needs of society--WPA Nursery Schools in the thirties were established to employ and give economic help to adults during the Depression with the provision for adequate nutrition and a program for their children. Lanham Act Centers were established during World War II to provide child care services so that mothers could be employed in essential industry in war impacted areas. Title XX funds place emphasis on employment and lowering the cost of welfare.

Let me go back to Santa Monica Children's Centers. They came into being because the community demanded that centers be provided for children whose mothers needed to work in aircraft and defense-related industries. Annette Bothman (1976), in her report on Reflections of the Pioneers on the Early History of the Santa Monica Children's Centers, writes about her interview with a member who served on the school board during the World War II years and recollects some of the feelings toward the Lanham Act Program:

> There were terrific problems on the Board of Education concerning the proposed program. I don't mean 'terrific,' in that they were bitter, but that most people in those days couldn't see much use for children going out of the home before they were in kindergarten, and it was only because of the war emergency that the school board passed it. One of the things they said was that the children didn't need to be in school at that age, and secondly, that we were just aping Russia where they took the children out of the home. Besides, it was expensive! Most of all, the problem was, they thought that once you begin it, you'll never end it. (p. 3)

They were right. It did begin and it has not ended. Thirty-four years later the program is still in operation--vital, healthy, and strong. The centers are not an appendage to be tolerated. They are considered an integral part of the school system. Top priority is the well-being of the children who attend the centers because the parents must be outside of their homes during the day. In addition, junior high and college students observe and participate in the centers as part of their class work and the centers serve as a community resource for families who, in most instances, are under acute financial pressures and have inadequate resources for health and social services.

This did not happen overnight. It came about because parents, center teachers, and administrators realized the importance of building a coalition with community leaders, agency representatives, the press and school people who could become advocates for children and support a program that kept families together and facilitated young children's growth and development. They were convinced that the more communication there was the greater chance for an informed and knowledgeable citizenry and the more informed and knowledgeable the citizenry the greater the chance for positive action and support. Parents invited their legislators and community leaders to the centers to see first hand what the program was like; center teachers made themselves available to organizations as speakers and workshop leaders; information about the centers was distributed through newsletters; positive relationships were established with the press and feature articles with pictures of center happenings were published and proved helpful in getting the message across that the centers provided a valuable and much needed service to children and families in the community. It took patience, endurance, dedication, and time but it was worth it. After all, are not children "the nation's most important national resource?"

Change takes time. At the local level it is brought about by people in the community--lay people, professionals, parents, agency representatives, legislators, and the press who have learned how to communicate and work together for a common cause . . . to feel a "part of" rather than "apart from."

There are still problems including the perennial ones of fragmentation and coordination of services, keeping parents actively and meaningfully involved, funding, housing, maintenance, and trying to keep up

with the constantly changing rules, procedures, and regulations. It would be wonderful if at the national level the people in the "upstairs room" who are responsible for the research, policy, regulations, and guidelines would keep in closer touch with the people in the "downstairs room" who are trying to implement services and programs. Practitioners sometimes wonder if the people in the "upstairs room" have ever had any experience operating programs or any experience living and working with large numbers of children of different ages in 11 to 12 hour day, 52 weeks a year programs.

When one has lived through a day in which one has had to try to explain to Mrs. Jones how Johnny happened to flush his socks down the toilet, listened to Mr. Smith whose custody case is about to be heard, tried to help Mrs. Thomas find someone to care for her three children while she is in the hospital for minor surgery, talked with the fire marshal who wants the extinguishers recharged, and with the maintenance men who arrived during rest time to put down the new rugs, and with a Board member who wants to know about the adult-child ratio, and with the representative from the insurance from the insurance company who wants the swings and sandboxes removed, and with the gardener to explain that it would help for the sprinkers to go on at a time when the children were not sitting on the grass listening to a story, and spent an hour looking for the keys which some creative, imaginative child has buried in the sandbox . . .; a directive, which says in part, "Therefore, to earn the contract amount for the current fiscal year, it is necessary for your agency to report the expenditure of local funds in an amount not less than the amount of funds that have been, or will be, deducted from the contract apportionment for the current fiscal year, as was indicated in your last fiscal report which explained that the amount deducted because payment was not submitted will not qualify as an expenditure" makes little sense.

When I am innundated with paperwork, edicts, contracts, applications, inspections, appraisals, evaluations, audits, reports and forms, I indulge in a fantasy that a directive will appear on my desk which reads, "Your job is to provide the best program you can for children. Get what help you need, involve parents and the community, monitor your program, and, if at the end of the year, you can show that children, parents, and the community have benefited we will continue to fund you." Is such fantasy too simple and unreasonable to become reality? Doesn't Helen Heffernan say that what we value we will pay for? And don't we say that we value children? But do we? Really?

References

Bothman, A. Reflections of the pioneers on the early history of the Santa Monica Children's Centers. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Northridge, 1976.

Prescott, E. Politics of day care. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1972.

Provence, S., Naylor, A., & Patterson, J. The challenge of day care. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Senn, M. J. E. Speaking out for America's children. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Steiner, G. A. The children's cause. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1976.

Toward a national policy for children and families. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976.

Citizen and Parent Participation in Policy Making and Program Implementation

Karen Hill-Scott
University of California, Los Angeles

About fifteen years ago, when an era of social reform was just beginning, a number of forces converged calling for federal intervention to reduce societal inequities. According to Moynihan (1970), intellectuals argued that the cycle of poverty which permeated the urban grey areas could not be broken without social intervention. Concurrently, there was a grass roots push, through the civil rights movement, for federal action to provide equality of opportunity. Pilot efforts at social intervention, such as the Ford Foundation's Grey Areas Program, were precursors to the War on Poverty, which would require that the poor have a voice in planning and implementing programs. Suffice it to say that after the mandate of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, "to obtain the maximum feasible participation of the poor" in federally funded programs, the notion of citizen participation in policy planning and decision making has slowly gained acceptance in many professional sectors.

As an educator and planner, my work with citizens has been in developing programs and policies for the care of young children. This arena, child care, seems a natural place for community people and professionals to merge efforts because the child is the integral, mutual interest of both groups. It seems strange that any of the professions involved with children could work independently of or at odds with their client communities. However, the history of the "helping" professions has been to establish distance between the helper and client and to depreciate the family while assisting it. Although many specific examples of exemplary service to families and children over the last fifty years could be cited, this traditional approach has led to a general dissatisfaction with the human service professions. According to Kahn (1973), these professions and their models of "helping" were challenged from within and pressured from without during the 1960s, leading to today's movement for child advocacy (Kahn, et al., 1973). Current training models and practices in the field are becoming more attuned to facilitating self-help within communities as well as working with people as peers and not always as clients-in-need.

It is my feeling that there are two fundamental questions regarding community participation in policy making from which other issues flow. The first one is, "should community people in involved in policy making and program implementation?" The second is, "what should their role be?" My answer to the former question is a resounding Yes. Community people are analogous to the constituents of a legislator in that the services public agencies offer should respond to the needs expressed by that community. Public agencies must be accountable to the community, or the consumers, because they have a right to these services. The most direct way to obtain community input is by establishing a dialogue between the professional and the client, where personal

knowledge and processed knowledge are treated on the same plane and receive mutual respect (Friedmann, 1973).

Of course, this position is easier to espouse than to implement. One of the greatest obstacles to increasing citizen participation is operationalizing the amorphous concepts of community and community resident. The easiest definition of community is a spatial one, and the least useful is one defined strictly by social networks. For the purposes of this discussion, the community and its residents can be defined as:

- an area delineated by geographic, territorial or other boundaries (such as a service district, catchment area, or natural boundaries);
- where its members are bound together by a number of characteristics or attributes held in common (values, attitudes, ethnicity, or class);
- its members are engaged in some form of sustained social interaction.

My rationale for greater community participation in policy making is four-fold. First, there is the need to enable families to penetrate and use the bureaucracy to their advantage. There are four professional service sectors which may directly impinge upon the life of the child. For most children, the sector of education will be the dominant institutional influence and the health sector is likely to be a distant second. For poor children, the welfare sector, which may offer family assistance and/or protective services, enters the picture. And, for children with any one of many problems, from family breakups to neglectful parents to incapacitation of the child, the legal system can absolutely and unequivocally determine their destiny. Each of these service sectors has its own peculiar bureaucracy, administrative procedures, and domain of power. According to Kahn (1973), working through these systems can be so complicated we may require an additional professional--the advocate--to speak for and assist the family seeking services. Advocacy is a fine idea, but it is a sham, unless it is community-based and takes into account the views of what local citizens and families feel is needed for services to function more efficiently and effectively. Simply adding another professional strand to the intricate web of children's services is like creating a duplicate set of social workers with new names: the child advocate.

This brings me to the second reason for involving community people in policy making. Community people of all classes and racial backgrounds have their own notions of "what is best" for optimal child development and "who best represents" children's interests. These views have inherent validity and with the exception of extreme points of view, need no more proof of their goodness than other commonly accepted precepts of child development. For example, I worked for over three years with a group of low-income Black people who wanted to start a child development program. Contrary to what the literature would suggest, they did know exactly what they wanted children to

learn in a preschool setting, and they had a vision of a child care program which was similar to those curricula concurrently being developed in Black independent schools around the country (Hill-Scott, 1974). It was quite different, though, from the sort of nursery school curriculum that would have emerged had an early childhood educator developed it for them, but without community input. For example, the community group felt a primary role of the child care program was to act as a socializing agent of young children. They identified 12 pro-social behaviors which they felt should be reinforced throughout the curriculum. They were very strong on developing a sense of cultural heritage and community spirit, and chose to subjugate individualism for cooperative accomplishment. This group also made sure community residents would begin training as day care workers so that a career ladder in children's services could be opened to them. The training program was accredited and is still underway. The center has opened, with many of the same residents involved in the planning now working as board members. Had I developed the child care program without their input, it would have reflected my biases, not theirs. In the final analysis, it was the contributions made by the community residents that created the unique curriculum, training program, and policy of the Tillmon Child Development Center. The waiting list of over 200 children is also a testament to the community's perception of the responsiveness of the program to their needs.

If community people hold valid views on "what is best" for children, then a concommitant reason for including their participation is to develop norms which reflect an amalgam of value systems, rather than the value system of the service sector. Schorr (1972), in his discussion of family values and policy, and Steiner (1976), in an entirely different kind of work on children's rights, both point out we avoid or deny the reality that government does interfere with family functioning. We therefore then to ignore family values in policy making and end up for the most part with superficial agreement on one or another proposal, but no coherent set of priorities related to national services for families and children (National Academy of Sciences, 1976).

The fourth reason for increasing community participation has to do with increasing rather than decreasing the ability of families to be self-sufficient. According to current census statistics and hearings before the Congress (1973), families are having a difficult time making it without some form of public support. I do not limit my comments to the poor, the increasing number of single parent families, and parents of children with special problems, but include stable two-parent, middle-income families. Increases in the cost of living have pushed many middle-class families to depend on two parent incomes (Bane, 1976). With this trend are greater demands for child care services which cost more than even the median income of $16,000 per year can tolerate (U.S. Census Update, 1973). In Los Angeles County, the average cost of care for one child is $32.00 per week, or $237.00 per month. Although there is substantial opposition to increasing government assistance to families, particularly for child care, the figures suggest government support would relieve the budget and enhance family functioning. Furthermore, the more closely aligned these services are with the communities they serve, the less encroachment on "family autonomy" will take place.

There are numerous other reasons which justify the need for greater community participation. They include increasing public control over the institutions which affect one's life, increasing accountability, and permitting a broader base of information upon which the subjective process of decision making can take place. Once the decision to espouse citizen participation has been reached, the issue changes to: what should the role of citizens be? Implementing community participation is a lot more difficult than advocating it. Four factors need to be considered before espousing the merits of one or another technique for obtaining citizen input.

First is the matter of scale: The techniques used and the depth of involvement required can vary as the issues at hand move from local to national level, or from the case to class level. Usually, the smaller the scale, the easier it is to introduce and maintain high levels of citizen or community involvement. The larger in scale and broader the policy concerns, the more likely that input from community groups will be shallow, unrepresentative, or low in interaction possibilities. These are realities which almost always circumscribe discussions of participatory techniques to local planning issues. Although there are advocates of unilateral direct participation, irrespective of scale, most proponents of citizen participation would agree that access to state or national planning is most limited. Greater use of the vote, and pressure group tactics are reluctant compromises for participating at these levels until outreach efforts (such as survey, community-based hearings, or participatory television) are instituted.

A second problem is developing mechanisms which match or are suited to the organizational structure of the bureaucracy involved. Education, though not the pinnacle of success with citizen participation, has an obvious headstart over the legal sector, for example. Also, since 1963, under the umbrella of advocacy, social welfare and mental health agencies have increased their levels of community participation. The point here is that each bureaucracy may require a different approach or mechanism for securing citizen input. An advisory committee to a legal aid office, serves a different function than employing community residents to conduct surveys, for example, in a planning study.

One must also consider when, in the planning or program implementation process, citizen input is either desired or is possible to obtain. Some techniques, such as establishing a permanent advisory board, permit ongoing community involvement. Other approaches such as mobilizing residents for a public hearing on pending legislation require a one-time-only effort. Even when citizen input is considered desirable as a permanent adjunct to program operations, there are different techniques which will elicit more or less input depending upon the program needs at that point in time.

Finally, the availability of resources is a crucial factor in successfully obtaining community participation. Although the effort of program staff and policy makers may determine whether or not lay people and professionals engage in a planning dialogue, there is greater flexibility in choosing techniques to be used when adequate resources are available.

After considering each of the above factors, it is possible to choose a technique which "fits" the situation. Low, moderate, or high involvement by staff and community people can be achieved. Also, each technique may carry a different level of control by citizens over the program. Arnstein (1969), in a now classic paper, developed a typology where rungs on a ladder corresponded to the extent of citizen power in determining policies and program procedures (Figure 1). Arnstein assumes that one of the goals of citizen participation is greater control of policy, though I dare say this is in contrast to the views of professionals in all sectors, who are more amenable to involvement from rungs 3-5 on Arnstein's ladder.

Figure 1

ARNSTEIN'S LADDER OF PARTICIPATION

8	Citizen Control	
7	Delegated Power	Degrees of Citizen Power
6	Partnership	
5	Placation	
4	Consultation	Degrees of Tokenism
3	Informing	
2	Therapy	
1	Manipulation	Non-Participation

In a review of the literature on citizen participation in planning, Youkobousky (1972) identified 50 separate techniques where professionals in transportation planning could interact with citizens. I have attempted to consolidate these into categories which are pertinent to this discussion (Figure 2).

Figure 2

TECHNIQUES OF PARTICIPATION

Low Citizen Involvement

(Almost exclusively staff-generated)

1. public information for the media
2. other public education (newsletters, etc.)
3. illustrations of problems in laymen's terms (unveil the secret language of the profession)
4. demonstration
5. public education about bureaucratic processes
6. listen to public for suggestions

Moderate Citizen Involvement

(Requires input by staff, as well as citizens)

1. surveys (children's views can be collected)
2. public hearings
3. participatory T.V.
4. community seminars

High Citizen Involvement

(Elicit greater responses and interaction with community)

1. field work (anthropological or otherwise)
2. citizen advisory committees
3. hiring of an advocate
4. decentralization of operations (field or satelite offices)
5. task force
6. workshops
7. informal neighborhood meetings
8. establishment and maintenance of key contacts in community
9. role playing
10. ombudsman
11. employment of community residents

My own experiences have gone up and down the ladder of participation. But the most useful one to reflect on is the three-year contract, from 1971-74 with what is now the Johnnie Tillmon Child Development Center in Los Angeles (Hill-Scott, 1974). As I mentioned, that center is still community-based and community-directed, even though funding is from the state.

The Tillmon Center began with the dream of welfare mothers to have a 24 hour child center in their community. In 1971, Johnnie Tillmon, now director of the National Welfare Rights Organization, approached the Chief of Pediatrics at the King-Drew Medical Complex for help in getting a center started. With a staff member at the hospital, the welfare mothers and other interested residents organized into a task force. We met regularly for three years to tranform the dream into a reality; the process evolved in five stages (Figure 3).

Figure 3

STAGES IN THE PROCESS OF PARTICIPATORY PLANNING

I. Identifying the Problem and/or Project: July 1971-January 1972

II. Establishing a Relationship: January 1972-April 1972

III. Working Toward Goals: April 1972-May 1973

IV. Stabilizing Goals Attained: May 1973-January 1974

V. Ending Project One; Recycling to Next Goal: January 1974--July 1974

Each stage was a growth process for me and for the residents. In retrospect, the process was often characterized by conflict, which, when resolved, led to group movement to the next stage of planning. Briefly summarized, the technique used was to establish a working committee, called the Task Force, which initially met to discuss the proposed child development program. This phase took five months of preliminary work by project staff and two months of meetings with the residents.

The second stage, establishing a relationship, was characterized by a process where boundaries of knowledge were established, a cojoint philosophy of education was drafted, and the format for a long-term working relationship was defined. this stage took four months to complete and evolve to Stage 3--actual work on developing the policy and substance of the child development program. For 13 months the Task Force labored on each element of the program. This phase went smoothly except for one event, which seriously threatened the whole effort. An investigation of the local Community Action Agency (CAA) put the Chief of Pediatrics right in the middle of a conflict regarding the CAA Headstart. His decision to take over administration of these programs threatened the job of the CAA Executive Director, who was a Task Force member's husband. Personal loyalty to the Task Force member led the residents to lose faith in the hospital and the planning process. A reassembling of the Task Force took place after concerted personal appeals were made.

Once the proposal, curriculum, and training model for the child development program was complete, the Task Force moved to Stage 4. For seven months, the accomplishments of the group were stabilized by seeking funds, obtaining zoning ordinances, working with contractors, and hiring staff. The idea for developing programs, using the same model of participatory planning was spread to other agencies in the same community. When it became apparent that funds and staff for the program were secure, I began phasing out my role as consultant. This was accomplished by taking a position in the first training program, which made me available to the Task Force, but not ever-present for meetings. The training program lasted six months, at which time the child development center opened for community use with the leadership of a staff director and community board. I was able to consider the planning process complete and terminated my working relationship with that program.

This experience taught me a few important lessons that I would like to pass on. The technique chosen does not guarantee good community participation any more than a particular therapy can "cure" a patient. The technique offers a way to get the process of interaction

started. For example, the Task Force could have been a perfunctory group that rubber-stamped proposals and appeased the community need for greater participation in developing child care programs. However, the motivation on the part of the hospital and myself as consultant, was to make this experience a genuine process of participatory planning. Thus, with effort and an open-ended schedule, we were able to progress developmentally toward our goals.

The process of community participation is time-consuming and evolves over time. It is very much like assembling a team of professional colleagues. Scheduling meetings for 12 people can be difficult; agreements are not reached quickly; and a true cross-section of ideas is not completely obtainable. Working with citizens is additionally difficult because the class conflicts between professionals and laypersons are not easily laid to rest. With the experiences I have described, it could be alleged that the input of the community residents was not representative of the community-at-large. Indeed, the Task Force members were not chosen at random to represent their community. However, an attempt to roughly approximate the diversity within the community was made and the Task Force members came from the visible and active sectors of the church, housing projects, a health center, the union, welfare mothers, and the PTA. Scheduling and commitment to participate was agreed upon early in the planning process. And differences among members were addressed and resolved as they appeared.

The point is that the higher involvement forms of participation are harder to implement than low involvement techniques. But all forms of input are possible to obtain, if there is organizational belief in its desirability and validity. After all, there is no substitute for the direct voice of the citizen, not even that of an advocate. As we move toward nationalizing certain services for children (and welfare is an eminent candidate), the collective views of communities who pay for and benefit from these services should definitely be heard. It would be naive to suggest that an exponential number of community groups be established to provide input on every policy issue or piece of human service legislation. My point is to establish acceptance of and respect for the input of laypersons, and to devise ways by which their participation in planning can be increased at all levels. Without their input we will develop programs designed for bureaucratic convenience (Kahn, et al., 1973). Moreover, we will make mistakes which lead to greater family strain rather than solidarity. The welfare policy which prohibited presence of the husband to receive welfare benefits for his family is an example of a negative regulation. The potential for these same kinds of mistakes is present in the formulation of policies to nationalize child care or other human services.

Though the use of citizen participation can be specious rather than genuine, my position is that it represents a mechanism which might abridge the distance between a policy and consequent service to clients. No one group--parents, citizens, or professionals in child care--has the complete or total right to decide policies for families and children. Our goal should be to establish dialogue among these parties.

References

Arnstein, S. A ladder of participation. AIP Journal, 1969, 216-224.

Bane, M. J. Here to stay: American families in the twentieth century. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Friedmann, J. Retracking America. New York: Anchor Books, 1973.

Hill-Scott, K. Participatory planning for a program of day care and child development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education, 1974.

Kahn, A., Kammerman, S., & McGowan, B. Child advocacy: Report of a-national baseline study. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of HEW, Office of Child Development, Children's Bureau, 1973.

Karp, D., Stone, G., & Yoels, W. Being urban: A social psychological-view of city life. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company, 1977.

Moynihan, D. P. Maximum feasible misunderstanding. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

National Academy of Science. Toward a national policy for children and families. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Science, 1976.

Schorr, A. Family values and public policy: A venture in prediction and prescription. Journal of Social Policy, 1972, 1(1), 33-44.

Steiner, G. The children's cause. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1976.

U. S. Congress. Hearing on trends and pressures facing the American family. Ninety-second Congress, 1973.

Youkobousky, R. Community interaction techniques for long range transportation planning. Research Report #40, New York State Department of Highway Planning, 1973.

Toward Influencing Those Who Make Public Policy for Families and Children: A Liaison Strategy

Paul R. Dokecki
George Peabody College
and the
Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies
Center for the Study of Families and Children

The charge to me as one of the discussants on this symposium was to respond to the presentations in terms of how policies for families and children are currently formed and to speculate on the possibilities for widening the participation of a greater number of individuals and groups in policy formation affecting the quality of life for children and their families in American society.

In the early forms of the four symposium presentations (Coons, Note 1; Feshbach & Feshbach, Note 2; Hill-Scott, Note 3; Zavitkovsky, Note 4), the key issue addressed by each author was the one expressed in the symposium's subtitle: "Who shall decide?" Each paper provocatively addressed different aspects of this issue. Attempts such as Coons' to formulate principles for choosing whether adults or children should decide in matters affecting families are needed, and, in fact, some of the work of our Vanderbilt Center is in this area. Feshbach and Feshbach raise important questions about the possibly conflicting roles of "expert" and "advocate" relative to the potential involvement of psychologists in public policy making. Continued and increased involvement by psychologists in the policy arena will surely require resolution of these problems and conflicts. Hill-Scott describes some important issues regarding the necessary involvement of parents in the planning and implementation of programs. Finally, Zavitkovsky's suggestion that the needs of families and children at the local community level be the beginning point for policy making, and that practitioners can help bring this about, constitutes a worthy challenge for psychologists.

My intent regarding these suggestions for choosing who should decide is to present several perspectives on how policy decisions are made. The policy decision-making process, as we shall see, is not easily amenable to influence by researchers, practitioners, families, or children. In this regard I shall offer a liaison (linking or middleperson) strategy to help bridge the gap between those who formulate policies and those who are influenced by them. I shall argue that what is needed is a knowledge-transfer process so that policy makers can receive accurate information about human needs and values, and the best available social and behavioral science findings. My assumption is that better decisions will be made by policy makers when this information is transferred in a useful and valid fashion. Useful, here refers to

---

Partial support for the preparation of this paper was provided by a grant from the Foundation for Child Development. Thanks are due to Daniel Costello, Erwin Hargrove, and Nicholas Hobbs who critically reviewed an early draft.

knowledge transfer that is in a form capable of making a difference in the behavior of policy-makers. When such transfer occurs, it is assumed that a more participatory policy-making process is the result.

In discussing the development of this knowledge-transfer strategy I will focus on problems faced by research-oriented behavioral and social scientists, although I believe that the general liaison approach would have utility if adapted to the situation of families, children, and practitioners vis a vis public policy makers.

The Gap Between the Scientific and Policy Communities

The word "gap" underscores the relationship between researchers and policy makers. For example, reminiscent of Max Weber, Caplan, Morrison, and Stambaugh (1975) propose a "Two-Communities Theory" wherein "social scientists and policy makers operate in separate worlds with different and often conflicting values, different reward systems, and different languages" (p. 50). Further, Rein and White (1977) describe:

> the fundamental incompatibility of the games of science and the games of politics. The games of science seek to establish pattens of experience that all may share. They are value-neutral in the sense that they are deliberately designed to filter out the values of the participants so as to arrive at the 'unbiased truth.' Best play in such games leads to assertions of findings that must be accepted by individuals whether they find them palatable or not. The proper posture for a gamesman of science must be one of restraint, dispassion, conservatism, the willingness to suspend belief pending more evidence. Now, the games of politics are quite different. They are designed to find one purpose or course of action acceptable to individuals who have begun the play by espousing diverse purposes, values, and actions. They are value-expressive, and facts enter in only as subordinated to and sustaining values, only as contributing to the delineation of an issue. Best play in such games leads toward the maximum possible satisfaction of one's purposes in the group action. The proper posture for a gamesman of politics is one of boldness, persistence, opportunism; the good gamesman is able to mobilize and sustain belief and commitment. (p. 269)

Although this fact-value incompatibility overdraws the issue to a certain extent, it is useful in helping us understand the difficulties in getting research information used in the policy-making process.

A recent illustration of the "gap" problem comes from a National Research Council (1975) report that found a lack of effectiveness of the

Office of Manpower Research and Development in influencing policy of the Department of Labor. The Council's report states:

> The lack of communication about R&D [research and development] is caused by differences in the cognitive worlds of government officials and researchers as well as their time priorities. The researcher isolates and examines one small piece of reality while the offical lives in a realm of buzzing confusion where variables scramble together and decisions must be made in the face of uncertainty. Mutual education is often necessary for government executives and reseachers to understand each other, but time for this interchange does not seem to be available. The pressure of daily business weighs upon officials, driving out long-range planning, problem anticipation, and efforts to cull R&D results for policy and program decisions. (p. 135)

The Council recommends the use of some form of intermediary process to improve this particular example of the two-communities problem.

In addition to recognizing the existence of the disparate research and policy communities, we must also recognize that policy making is not a linear and totally rational process--not a process describable in systematic problem-solving terms. In fact, Rein and White (1977) talk of "the problem-solving image as myth" (p. 268) when applied to the research-policy interface, a myth based on a longstanding nonconflict fantasy held by many scientists and policy makers alike. In this fantasy, "on the scientific side, it expresses the hope that participation in political activities is, or can be made to be, a matter of value-neutral decision making" (p. 270) while "on the political side, the fantasy expresses the hope that contributory science can (a) retain its authority, while (b) remaining employable for the settlement of political value questions" (p. 270).

For Rein and White (1977), in contradistinction to the myth, the reality of policy making involves three processes: (1) defining or setting problems as a step in the process of issue setting, (2) mobilizing the governmental bureaucratic structure for action, and (3) settling dilemmas and achieving value tradeoffs. There is a potential for the use of behavioral science research information in each of these processes, however, "the link is neither consensual, graceful nor self-evident" (Rein, 1976, p. 12).

Assuming that a useful transfer of research knowledge into the policy-making arena can be accomplished, such knowledge could be quite helpful in defining problems. Problem definition, however, is only an aspect of the more crucial process of issue setting, wherein "contending political groups vie with one another in construing the problematic situation, but not in the spirit of rival scientific theorists. Each seeks to mobilize belief in an issue with implications for action, and the fundamental goal of the effort is the mobilization of the fine structure of governmental action--the creation of an effective coalition

on either the legislative or administrative plane" (Rein & White, 1977, p. 164). Without further translation and transmission of scholarship into the political and value context, the most cogently and validly defined problem will never achieve the status of an issue commanding the attention of legislators or program bureaucrats. It is likely that failure to influence issue setting has been one of the major shortcomings of the numerous commissions, conferences, and learned groups that have addressed policies regarding the problems of children and families.

It is difficult to identify very many, if any, instances of the effective use of behavioral science in issue setting. Surely, the issue was already set when Kenneth B. Clark testified before the Supreme Court in 1954 regarding the possible psychologically harmful effects of segregation. It is possible that Susan Gray's work on early intervention helped, as Sargent Shriver has claimed, to set the issue for the development of Project Head Start. But it is also plausible that the Great Society would have had its Head Start in any event. Daniel Patrick Moynihan's social science tract on the Black family was certainly notorious, however, its ultimate influence is diffuclut to determine. As a final example, Jensen's genetic argument against compensatory education was most certainly publicized and used politically, however, it is likely that this amounted to a post hoc justication for political decisions already made.

The difficulty of bringing behavioral and social science findings to bear on policy making in an effective fashion is dramatically illustrated by the track record of the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), created by Congress in 1974 to provide it with budgetary and policy analysis pursuant to more effective legislative action. Headed by Alice Rivlin, the CBO has received very high marks on the quality of both its budgetary and policy analyses, however, it has not had anything approaching significant impact on Congressional decision making (Havemann, 1977). This is so despite the CBO's remarkably strategic position relative to Congressional decision makers. We are certainly justified in asking: If not the CBO, then who?

Returning to Rein and White's (1977) analysis of the research-policy gap, they have maintained that:

> Larger policy questions rest on dilemmas and trade-offs in a virtually definitional manner. That is, if a problem is clear, uncontested, and univalued, it ordinarily does not emerge at high levels of political debate. It is a technical problem. Its solution will ordinarily be debated and resolved through technical and bureaucratic institutions outside the central policy-making arenas of government. (p. 266)

Again, assuming the existence of a useful knowledge-transfer process, researchers can and should have an influence on Rein and White's "technical problems" without too much difficulty. But many of us aspire to influence the "larger policy questions," and it is here that a knowledge-transfer process is taxed to the utmost.

Toward Policy-Research Knowledge Transfer

Contrary to many researchers' beliefs, research knowledge transfer is not an automatic process. Having built our better knowledge mousetraps, the world rarely beats paths to the doors of our laboratories or libraries. Recently, there has been developing a long overdue interest in the knowledge production and utilization process (e.g., see Human Interaction Research Institute, 1976), but Caplan, et al. (1975) have commented:

> The need for reciprocal relations between knowledge producers and knowledge users in policy making is quite clear, but the problem of achieving effective interaction of this sort necessarily involves value and ideological dimensions as well as technical ones.
>
> That is not an issue that has gone unrecognized. In fact, there has been much attention given to training knowledge utilization experts, building knowledge retrieval systems, and experimenting with knowledge transfer groups in order to interlace social science knowledge production with policy information needs. These transfer formulations and "linkage" efforts, however, have largely been based on oversimplified interpretations of the "gap" problem, and, in consequence, they have not been remarkably effective. For example, despite the sizeable investment of effort and funds that have gone into the development and promotion of computerized information retieval systems, there is no indication that they have lived up to their promise. They clearly have not revolutionized and, perhaps, not even enriched, governmental decision making. (p. 51)

To remedy this state of affairs, Caplan, et al. (1975) have called for creation of institutional settings that support individuals who are willing and able to understand the worlds of both policy research knowledge production and knowledge utilization in policy making. Based on this understanding, such individuals--I will call them <u>policy liaison specialists</u> (Dokecki, Note 5)--would engage in activities such as:

> (a) making realistic and rational appraisals of the relative merit of the enormous amount of diversified information which abounds in the social sciences; (b) creating accurate and concise translations of social science research to facilitate communication with the policy setting community; (c) recasting policy issues into researchable terms; (d) recognizing and distinguishing between scientific and extrascientific knowledge needs; (e) dealing with the value issues and bureaucratic factors that influence the production and use of scientific knowledge; and finally (f) gaining the trust of policy

> makers and obtaining sufficient knowledge of policy processes to substantially introduce social science knowledge in usable form into the policy-making process at the key point where it will be most likely to be used. (Caplan, et al., 1977, p. 51)

Whether or not one person can perform all these functions is doubtful. The Caplan, et al. items (a)-(d) are more research oriented; items (e) and (f) are more political-process oriented. Perhaps two kind of liaison policy specialists are necessary, however, their work would not be construed as linear and sequential--it must go on simultaneously. It is clearly the case that the probability of productive use of the information developed by the research function is greatly increased if those in the political process are involved in the policy-research endeavor from the outset (Human Interaction Research Institute, 1976).

What I am proposing is a policy-research function, or the establishment of policy-research centers, wherein psychologists and other social scientists review, analyze, and synthesize policy-relevant research--and occasionally perform original empirical work--within the context of active and ongoing interchange with policy makers. The goal is to improve policy decision making through the useful presentation of the best available knowledge on a range of policy options in given policy problem areas, such as child care, parent education, maternal and child health, and care for the handicapped. We are planning to use such a strategy in Vanderbilt's Center for the Study of Families and Children (e.g., Hobbs, Dokecki, & Dunlop, Note 6), and it is likely that variations on the theme are used by such organizations as Brookings, RAND, and several university-based policy centers.

The development of a policy liaison strategy is necessary to facilitate the knowledge-transfer task performed by policy-research centers, and, I would argue, is necessary for any of the constituencies mentioned on this symposium to influence the policy-making process. The strategy involves "middleperson" or "translation" functions linking a constituency and its body of knowledge and values with the policy-making process. These functions involve roles at several levels along a continuum of amount of required effort or contest. The assumption is that the least necessary contest should be used to achieve one's goals (Middleman & Goldberg, 1974).

The highest level of contest is the role of <u>advocate</u>. It involves the assumption that there is a conflict between what research seems to indicate is needed for the welfare of children and families (e.g., guaranteed minimum income or readily available child care options) and what policy makers seem inclined to do or to fail to do. In effect, the <u>policy-liaison-specialist-as-advocate</u> intervenes in the policy process to help a class (e.g., families and children) to obtain its entitlement (Middleman & Goldberg, 1974). As to approach, Richan and Rosenberg (cited in Middleman & Goldberg, pp. 55-56) suggest:

> An important priciple in advocacy is making it easy for the target system to say yes. For instance, the put-down--humiliation--of a decision-maker may

> be personally gratifying to the advocate but it is the surest way to build a wall of resistance. The advocate needs to be prepared to help the target system save face. Related to this is the need of the target system to justify its actions. The advocate can help in supplying the rationale for a positive response.

Advancing toward the other end of the continuum, the role of policy-liasison-specialist-as-mediator/broker requires less effort and contest than that of the advocate. Rather than outright conflict, mediation/ brokerage presumes a common bond, which may be either operational or nonoperational. "It is the aim of the mediator to help the parties . . . to rediscover (if necessary) their need for each other, thereby freeing them to contribute to each other's welfare" (Middleman & Goldberg, 1974, pp. 59-60). In a situation where the research community with its body of knowledge and the community of policy makers seem to have lost touch with each other, but where there is a presumption of potential common meeting ground, the liaison mediator might (a) attempt to identify this common ground, (b) identify the obstacles to the meeting, (c) provide useful information to permit research to begin to enter the policy process. Where operational complementarity of interest between researchers and policy makers and the ready availability of research information relevant to a policy problem may be assumed, what is required is translation of the information into a form usable by policy makers--a kind of brokerage function--with particular attention paid to the political and societal values at stake. Also required is provision of information on (a) level and source of resources needed for the implementation of given policy options, and (b) the organizational structures that might be involved (see Hargrove, 1975). A useful mediation/brokerage tool is the conference, "that encounter where two or more persons consult together, compare opinions, deliberate, and devise actions to be taken" (Middleman & Goldberg, 1974, P. 73). Within such conferences, preferably held throughout the policy-research process, needs and pressures would be translated into tasks, and alternative policies and their consequences would be delimited. It is likely that the mediator/brokerage role would be the one most commonly used by policy liaison specialists.

The choice of particular strategies on the advocacy to mediation/ brokerage continuum would be made within an overarching framework based on the best available research on the knowledge-transfer process. In this regard, I would like to propose what seems to be a sensible synthesis of elements developed by Glaser (1973), Havelock and Lingwood (1973), and Short (1973). These elements, among many others, are presented in a recent highly useful volume, Putting Knowledge to Use, developed by the Human Interaction Research Institute (1976) in collaboration with the National Institute of Mental Health.

Havelock and Lingwood offer a linkage model of knowledge transfer involving a client or user system (policy makers), a knowledge or resource system (the research community), a need processing system wherein user needs are determined (an aspect of the liaison function), and a solution processing system wherein solutions derived from research

are determined, translated, and transmitted to users (another aspect of the liaison function). Elaborating these notions somewhat, Short proposes three necessary subaspects of knowledge production between the resource and user systems: (a) integration--synthesis or interpretation of existing research knowledge; (b) translation--transmission, translation, and transformation of existing or potential solutions within the research knowledge base; and (c) linkage--the actual process of bridging the gap between researchers and policy makers, through, for example, advocacy or mediation/brokerage. Finally, Glaser has identified important factors in the knowledge-transfer process that must be considered: (a) early involvement of key users in the knowledge-transfer process; (b) provision of supplemental support beyond written or oral communication, such as technical assistance and consultation; (c) appropriate timing of the provision of information to users; and (d) personal contact with strategically involved users. At our Vanderbilt Center we are attempting to apply such elements both directly, through contacts with key policy makers, and indirectly, through links with advocacy groups and professional organizations that have a reasonable probability of contact with, and influence on, policy makers in the judicial, legislative, and executive branches of government.

If the case for the policy-liaison-specialist role and functions is accepted, psychology, as well as other behavioral and social science disciplines, must begin to determine the nature of training required to produce these individuals. Without people to perform this role, the attempt of this symposium and related efforts to determine who should decide public policies for families and children will remain a purely academic issue. Knowing who should decide leaves unsolved the problem of how their viewpoints can be inserted effectively into the policy-making process.

Reference Notes

1. Coons, J. E. Policies for children: How to decide who gets to decide. In R. Takanishi (Chair), Public policy for children and families: Who shall decide? Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1977.

2. Feshbach, N. D., & Feshbach, S. Public policy for children: Psychological perspective. In R. Takanishi (Chair), Public policy for children and families: Who shall decide? Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1977.

3. Hill-Scott, K. Citizen and parent participation in policy making and program implementation. In R. Takanishi (Chair), Public policy for children and families: Who shall decide? Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1977.

4. Zavitkovsky, D. Grounding policy in children's needs: Practitioner's perspective. In R. Takanishi (Chair), Public policy for children and families: Who shall decide? Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychologica Association, San Francisco, August 1977.

5. Dokecki, P. R. Prospectus for an experimental and special training program for human development liaison specialists. Unpublished manuscript, George Peabody College, 1977.

6. Hobbs, N., Dokecki, P. R., & Dunlop, K. To strengthen families: An analysis of public policies and policy options related to the enablement of parents. Unpublished manuscript, Vanderbilt University and George Peabody College, 1977.

References

Caplan, N., Morrison, A., & Stambaugh, R. J. The use of social science knowledge in policy decisions at the national level. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1975.

Glaser, E. M. Knowledge transfer and institutional change. Professional Psychology, 1973, 4, 434-444.

Hargrove, E. C. The missing link: The study of the implementation of social policy. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1975.

Havelock, R. G., & Lingwood, D. A. R & D utilization strategies and functions: An analytical comparison of four systems. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1973.

Haveman, J. After two years, CBO gets high marks from Congress. National Journal, 1977, 9, 1256-1260.

Human Interaction Research Institute. Putting knowledge to use: A distillation of the literature regarding knowledge transfer and change. Los Angeles, Calif.: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1976.

Middleman, R. R., & Goldberg, G. Social service delivery: A structural approach to social work practice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.

National Research Council. Knowledge and policy in manpower. A study of the Manpower Research and Development Program in the Department of Labor. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1975.

Rein, M. Social science and public policy. New York: Penguin Books Ltd., 1976.

Rein, M., & White, S. H. Policy research: Belief and doubt. Policy Analysis, 1977, 3, 239-272.

Short, E. C. Knowledge production and utilization in curriculum: A special case of the general phenomenon. Review of Educational Research, 1973, 43, 237-301.

Psychologists and Public Policy or Making the Most of the Washington Situation

William Bevan
Duke University

When Professor Seymour Feshbach telephoned to invite me to participate in the present symposium, I was greatly flattered and, of course, agreed forthwith. After I had hung up the telephone receiver and reflected on what I had agreed to, I was at a loss to understand why he had been so gracious as to invite me. I am neither a social nor a developmental psychologist. Furthermore, I have never had any occasion to involve myself in matters of child or family welfare policy and am, quite literally, totally ignorant of it. I have spent the better part of the last 15 years engaged at the fringe of the federal policy-making process, but that certainly does not quality me to serve as a discussant on this program; for the creation of policy is a highly complex, highly focused, and at the same time, highly variable sequence of events, and involvement in one sector does not render one an expert in another.

Indeed, I suppose the first myth that should be dispelled is that there is a totally explicit, completely rational, clearly formalized, and fully comprehensive set of statements that constitutes the nation's policy in each aspect of national life. The average citizen, being a rational person, prefers to assume that such is the case. After all, the term policy is a high-sounding word! But such, in fact, is not the case. Instead, public policy--federal, state, or local--is what, in the final instance, the relevant bureaucracy chooses to do about a particular matter. Indeed, even to say chooses is to imply a degree of formal consensus or of deliberateness that is not always present. Perhaps, it would be nearer to the truth to say persists in doing. For the nation's policies on a particular question may be nothing more than the sum total of the ways an indeterminate number of unidentified functionaries scattered throughout the range of bureaus and offices of the government have come over time to deal with that particular question.

The fact that we are unable or unwilling to achieve broad consensus on a principle for action on a particular matter in itself constitutes de facto a policy. Some years ago, psychologists bandied about a pair of terms that they had borrowed from biology, phenotypic and genotypic, to discriminate between the apparent and the real. It strikes me that this is a useful distinction for us in the present context. When the federal government sets the lawful speed at 55 miles per hour, either as a means of conserving a natural resource or of controlling a state of political dependency or both, but fails to effectively enforce that limit, this tells me that the real but implicit policy with regard to gasoline consumption is that while there may not be an unlimited world supply of petroleum, the situation is not sufficiently serious to inconvenience the electorate. A policy, then, can, be any principle, plan, or course of action and the bottom line is course of action.

Having disqualified myself by virture of lack of training and experience, I must now further disqualify myself by virtue of lack of proper preparation. During the period I had set aside to put together these remarks, I had access only to the abstracts, the chairperson's orienting remarks, and one other paper. Please be assured that I am not being critical of my colleagues on the panel. Discussants are more vain than wise, otherwise they would never agree to be discussants, and it is the nature of things that authors either do not have their papers prepared or insist on revising them until the very last minute before the meeting. Thus, through nobody's fault, I suffer from a kind of benign neglect. However, through confronting the twin facts, lack of expertise and lack of preparation, I have suddenly come to realize how I indeed do qualify for panel membership. I am the panel's layperson and no self-respecting panel would be without a layperson these days.

The question then became for me one of what should I do as a discussant. Never having been wildly successful at improvization, I decided before coming to San Francisco to do three things: first, to suggest a layperson's response to the general issue raised by the title of the symposium; second, to sketch ways in which I, as a layperson with regard to child welfare, think psychologists, both as individuals and in a corporate sense, should and can have a role in the generation of policy (I shall try to deal with specific observations of the members of the panel in this context); and, finally, as a layperson, to call your attention to some important, immediately impending national legislation.

The concern of the symposium is with a procedural issue rather than an issue of substance. It is an issue, however, that is extremely important in a democracy, namely, who shall decide what a public policy shall be. The only acceptable answer, in the general case, is, of course, the citizens. But, who among the citizens? One may argue for all of the citizens--but when the universe gets larger than the town meeting, this is scarcely practical. Thus, the matter becomes one of who shall represent the citizens and how these representatives shall be chosen. The answer that I draw from the material that I have had available for this session is that policy should reflect the consensus of a broad spectrum of participants. This is consistent with the spirit of the times, for we have seen in the decade of the seventies an increasing number of persons asserting their right of citizenly participation.

The panel suggests, in sum, that three classes of representatives should be involved. (1) Those that have special qualifications to judge what is in the public interest. This is the tradition of the expert found in any public arena where the issues have technological referents (and I use the term technology in an extremely broad sense to include scientific, legal, and priestly). It is also a reflection of the tradition of elites in governance roles. (I am struck by the possibility that here today we are again the elite still doing the deciding.) (2) Those that are the affected parties. Increasingly, since the period of the Vietnam War, the public conviction has grown that the people who bear the consequences of policy action have a right to say what that policy

shall be. In an extrapolation of the logic of Clemanceau, the little citizen is saying that the issue is much too important to be left to the experts. The rights of the affected parties in the matter of child and family welfare is not a new issue. It seems to me that I recall Edward Zigler some years ago talking about the involvement of parents on behalf of children. Certainly, the 1973 report of the Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children asserted the principle quite vigorously and indeed further reflected the spirit of the times by its special reference to the socially deprived. Professor Dokecki's Center for the Study of Families and Children, which views itself as a model for a national program of policy-related, applied social research, is quite explicitly committed to broad representation in the formulation of policy. Another present theme is the increasingly frequent question of centralized authority. More and more people are apprehensive, not only about the loss of personal identity within larger social systems, but also about the dysfunctional properties of such systems. Devolution is in the air. We see it for the intellectual crowd in Schumacher's (1973) little book, Small is Beautiful, but also in the Nixon Administration's proposals for revenue-sharing with the states, as well as in some current socialist diagnoses of the problems of the British economy (Luke, 1977) and in a variety of other places. (3) The third class of participant is the general citizen, a person who is qualified by virtue of citizenship and by the fact that he or she will subsidize the implementation of the policy with tax dollars. It is presumed that the primary concern of the lay participant is with questions of cost-benefit relationship.

Given the way that policy is generated in this country, the question, "Who shall decide?" resolves itself, I think, into a matter of competence versus special interest. It becomes difficult to reconcile when, as Professor Coons (Note 1) has pointed out, there is a question concerning the qualifications of the affected party to judge the effectiveness of a policy solution; that is, a question of whether or not the affected party can decide what is indeed beneficial for himself for himself or herself. Furthermore, it is almost always the case that there is no simple black-and-white solution. Policies are almost always tradeoffs between benefits and liabilities, and quite often the margin of benefit is small. Let me mention an issue currently in the news, at least where I live. Should the government be a party to threatening the health of its citizens through the payment of agricultural price supports on tobacco, when to remove them would have a major effect upon the regional economy of the South? What becomes clear when you contemplate a question like this is that it cannot be resolved by the methods of science. Its resolution comes with the ultimately arbitrary setting of priorities on values. In practical terms, the answer is found in political clout--the ability to control or persuade policy makers. And political clout is a matter of votes.

The overall question of the symposium thus seems to me to be incorrectly put. One cannot in a final sense legislate who shall decide. The question in practical terms is who will decide. Given the way our processes of governance work, it will be that combination of persons who are willing to assert their interest in the issue and, who through dint of persistence, skill, and political influence, are able to exercise

an impact on the direction of policy resolution. The crucial aspects of a policy dispute almost always lie precisely in the realm of values, not that of facts. Indeed, as Dorothy Nelkin (1976) points out in her evaluation of the recently proposed Science Court, as the policy importance of an issue increases, the significant of straightforward technical questions decreases. The goals of policy are set by the resolution of political and social values; the mechanisms to achieve these goals may be selected on the advice of experts. I assume that it is self-evident that for such expert advice to be useful for policy purposes, it must have predictive value. But whatever its intrinsic value, its impact will depend on the political climate. If the climate is unfavorable, no mustering of facts will influence the policy. On the other hand, if the climate is favorable, the experts may precipitate a policy decision whether they intend to or not. There was, for example, a time in the not too distant past when any scientific data that suggested that a food additive was likely to be carcinogenic resulted in its being put by the FDA on the list of banned substances. The recent resistance to the banning of saccharine indicates that this is no longer the case. In a paper on myths about human development, Edward Zigler (1973) made reference to a logically untenable statement that has been given wide popular circulation, namely, that half the learning of a child is over by age four. This is just the sort of idea that, when voiced publicly, is apt to be rushed by politicians into legislation or program policies. And that is precisely what has happened. During the mid-1960s the critical age concept was used as rationale for the funding of compensatory intervention programs involving children with backgrounds of poverty during the preschool years (e.g., Headstart, Parent-Child Centers). Given today's political climate, the impact of such a view would be far less pronounced and, indeed, differing perspectives would very likely take policy in quite different directions.

Policy is the end product of an adversary process. Policy-relevant research must be tied into this valuative discourse. And this, in turn, means that dependent variables have to be chosen from the larger value systems that mark the community to be served by the policy being shaped (MacRae, 1976). But this is a discussion that must be postponed to another occasion.

It has been suggested that the only way to accomplish a mutual accommodation of expert and lay values if through vigorous public debate. While I would not deny that public debate can be a very useful device for focusing community attention on policy issues, I am not persuaded that it will inevitably produce reconciliation. In some situations it may, indeed, produce a contrary effect, as in the yet unresolved case of radiation standards in this country. What is needed more than anything, I believe, are experts who take time to understand better than they typically do at present the relationship of expert testimony to the public policy process. Furthermore, it seems to me, that to propose debate as the ultimate instrument is to overlook the very important and inevitable role of political negotiation. To say, also, that the benefits of a policy based on the involvement of all relevant constituencies would be great strikes me as romantically wishful thinking. First of all, all constituencies will not have an equal voice, and to imply that they will would be unrealistic. The larger

the number of constituencies, the greater the likelihood of controversy and the greater the likelihood, particularly if the influence of constituencies is relatively evenly matched, that the outcome will be no policy action or an action so compromised as to be ineffective. President Johnson and Mayor Daley, whatever one may think of them or their political philosophies, were effective expediters of policy. They didn't gain that reputation by allowing everyone an equal role in the process.

What rules of thumb are useful for the scientist who wants to assume a meaningful role in the policy process? Let me suggest a few, with, regretably, little elaboration because of the limits of time. But, before I do, let me repeat what Seymour and Norma Feshbach have already made clear: namely, that there are two kinds of roles, educational and advocacy, and I'll want to say more about these when I talk in a moment about institutional roles.

1. Become thoroughly familiar with the institutions for policy making and how they work. Give special attention to the budgetary process and its relation to policy. I would strongly urge that psychology departments develop a special seminar or course to be taken by graduate students before completing their doctoral requirements that will provide a practical knowledge of the relationships that obtain between science, politics, and government.

2. Maintain an up-to-date knowledge of legislative issues. The Association for the Advancement of Psychology (AAP) does an exceptionally fine job in summarizing the legislative picture in the columns of the APA Monitor. They can always provide additional information. Join AAP and help support their work with your time and dollars.

3. Get to know your representatives in Congress, in the state legislature, and at local levels. Their offices can provide copies of legislation and other useful documents. Indeed, it is extremely important for you to understand that any advice you may proffer decision makers will receive prompt attention to the extent that you are known to and trusted by them. Stay strictly nonpartisan in any educational role you may assume with regard to legislation. Those of you who are academics start with an advantage--decision makers tend to view professors as above petty self-interest. Don't limit your contacts to politicians; get to know their legislative aides. Legislative aides play a significant role in the preparation of legislation.

4. Shed all jargon; write and speak the English of the people. Your don't have to be a Hemingway. Margaret Mead English will do.

5. When you give advice, provide background, or present testimony, make clear in simple language the confidence you place in your opinions. At the same time, don't equivocate. Policy makers want answers and a "on the one hand, A; however, on the other hand, B" won't help them very much. This does not mean that you should let them lead you beyond your own prudent levels of confidence in the validity of your advice. That will do no one any good.

6. Learn patience and persistence. Rome wasn't built in a day. Involvement with the political process--whether in educational or advocacy roles--is no activity for the one-shot artist. Develop a thick hide and learn to control your temper, if you haven't already done so.

7. Keep your educational and advocacy roles distinctly separated. This is easier said than done. Even the most "neutral" statement of fact may contain implicit value judgments. Mixing roles is the easiest way to lose a hard-earned reputation for trustworthiness. In the early days of the energy crisis, the Ford Foundation, wanting to nudge the country toward confronting the need for a national energy policy, established an Energy Policy Project, created an advisory board of distinguished citizens from government, the universities, and the corporate world, and organized a project staff under the direction of a lawyer named David Freeman. The Foundation spent some 4 million dollars on the project and Mr. Freeman and his staff produced a 21-volume compendium and a final report called A Time to Choose. Six thousand copies of the final report wre given to persons in government and members of the press; 30,000 copies were sold in book stores, and 300,000 copies were made available to the Book-of-the-Month Club. From the beginning, however, Mr. Freeman, who was a fervent advocate of environmental reform, used the project as a platform for his own personal political and ideological views. As a result, the advisory board suffered both internal dissension and external discredit. Knowledgeable people challenged the report's intellectual integrity and the Foundation ultimately stood charged with spreading ideological propaganda. The effort to date, as far as I know, has added up to essentially nothing. In outlining this case history, I am in no way implying any comment on the merit of Mr. Freeman's views. Rather, my purpose is to illustrate the hazards of confusing advocacy with education (for a full account, see Lapham, 1977).

I think that perhaps the easiest way of keeping educational and advocacy roles separate is through separate institutional settings. In the case of psychologists, the APA (American Psychological Association) is for education, the AAP for advocacy. Furthermore, when you engage in advocacy, keep guild and public interest issues straight in your mind and then get there, as a famous Confederate general once said, "the fastest with the mostest."

8. Give serious consideration to the ultimate role as citizen, runny for public office. Government sorely needs people who can look beyond assertions to assumptions and beyond mechanisms to objectives. Above all, it needs people who can resist the temptation to impose simple solutions upon complex problems.

In the matter of institutional mechanisms, I won't talk about possible roles for the university. The university has been widely discussed as an instrument for engaging the public process. It has both advantages and limitations that are, I am sure, familiar to you. Rather, I would like to concentrate on the scientific associations, which have largely failed to realize their potential as vehicles for the political education of their constituencies.

The APA, given the right commitment, could do a number of useful things.

1. It could conduct workshops on the policy process for those of its members who want to acquire a background for participating in public affairs.

2. It could, on a larger scale, organize sessions at the annual meeting for the discussion of legislative issues of concern to the profession.

3. It could organize more extended discussions of important legislation. For example, each year the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) conducts a two-day conference on the federal R&D (research and development) budget that eventuates in a paperback book available to the public.

4. It could organize regularly scheduled, closed seminars for members of Congress and their legislative aides that deal with the behavioral science findings relevant to current legislative issues. By keeping the seminars closed, one provides an atmosphere for free give-and-take. The AAAS and The Brookings Institution ran such seminars quite successfully for a number of years.

5. It could be prepared to provide consulting services for legislators when they need them. APA and AAP already have made excellent progress toward providing testimony before Congressional Committees, but the several Boards and divisions of APA could do a better job of organizing back-up resources: people ready to help prepare testimony and testify on short notice, among others.

6. It could create staff and committee machinery to produce in-depth studies of scientific and technological issues relevant for current legislation. This would mean a function similar to that of the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) and the recently proposed Institute for Congress.

7. It could give more vigorous support to the Congressional Science Fellows Program that places young scientists in roles as legislative aides with Committees of the Congress. It is my impression that the Executive Officer of APA has had to struggle each year to keep funds in the budget for the support of one fellow. AAAS, which coordinates the program for the several participating societies, places and provides guidance for some 16 fellows annually, a major portion of whom are staying in legislative or related work. I, at present, have a postdoctoral program at Duke that is sending three behavioral scientists each year to the Washington program.

As I noted earlier in these remarks, I am not intimately familiar with legislative issues in the child welfare field. Consequently, I am extremely grateful for very helpful briefings by Clarence Martin and Charlotte Voorde, both of AAP, by Pamela Ebert-Flattau of the National Academy of Sciences, and by Ellen Hoffman of the Children's Defense Fund.

This spring the White House had the Child Health Assessment Act of 1977 introduced into the Congress. The relevant bills are HR6706 and S1397, designed to improve the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment Program that was legislatively established in 1967. If passed in its present form, it would require states to extend Medicaid benefits to otherwise ineligible children under 6, expand medical services, liberalize eligibility requirements, set explicit standards for health providers, raise federal matching levels, provide financial incentives to states for good performance, change the strategy of penalties for lack of compliance and add 25 million dollars to the current appropriation level to expand services. I wish there were time to discuss these bills in detail. However, let me simply say that knowledgeable persons feel that the bill as it now stands is too weakly worded to recruit the range of needed service providers, that the 25 million dollars for expanded services is far too small an amount, that the provision for getting information on this program to eligible families is inadequate, that the bill as it is now structured contains loopholes that will allow states to reduce their contribution to the program, that there are still many needy children who would not be covered by the proposed changes in the present law, and that enforcement policy should be tightened.

These bills were expected to have been in committee this summer, and I didn't have opportunity to check on their particular status before I left for San Francisco. At any rate, I would strongly urge those of you with legislative concerns in this area to obtain copies of the bill, study it carefully, and contact Clarence Martin of AAP with an offer of help with any AAP-APA effort to shape the legislation in the direction that you feel is in the best interest of families and children. This means getting the bill you think is right out of committee, through the authorization process and into the budget bill.

Reference Note

1. Coons, J. E. Policies for children: How to decide who gets to decide. In R. Takanishi (Chair), Public policy for children and families: Who shall decide? Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1977.

References

Children's Defense Fund. EPSDT: Does it spell health care for poor children? Washington, D.C.: Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project, Inc., 1977.

Children's Defense Fund. The Child Health Assessment Act of 1977: A brief analysis of the administration's CHAP proposal. Unpublished manuscript, Spring 1977.

Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. Social change and the mental health of children. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Lapham, L. H. The energy debacle. Harper's Magazine, August 1977, 58-74.

Luke, P. Aspects of nationalism. Planet, 1976, (32), 42-44.

MacRae, D., Jr. The social function of social science. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

Nelkin, D. Thoughts on the proposed Science Court. Unpublished manuscript, 1976.

Schumacher, E. F. Small is beautiful. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Zigler, E. Myths and facts: A guide for policy makers. Compact, July-August 1973, 18-21.

REFLECTIONS ON THE SYMPOSIUM

The Role of Social Scientists in Policy Formation

Ruby Takanishi
University of California, Los Angeles

Each participant has offered ideas about how public policy for children and families should be made. Their suggestions concerning these important procedural and normative questions are rooted in their particular life situations--in their training and professional roles as well as in their cultural and social values as citizens and individuals. However, the papers share a common perspective best reflected in Bevan's (Note 1) comment that policy formation "is a highly complex, highly focused, and at the same time, highly variable sequence of events" (p. 39). I would add that groups and individuals involved in the policy-formation process will approach any specific policy issue with multiple understandings of its goals, a factor which contributes to its characteristics of complexity, indeterminacy, and conflict.

As I reflect on this symposium, three areas concerning the role of social scientists in policy formation come to mind. There is a critical need for social scientists to study the actual processes of policy making regarding children and families. In addition to research, social scientists should be trained for various roles in the policy arena. Finally, social scientists can become involved in current policy debates in several ways. These three activities are not necessarily independent. Individuals will and should be involved in the intersection of different areas.

The need for research on policy making. In examining the many recent books and papers on family policy (Keniston, et al., 1977; National Academy of Sciences, 1976), one is struck by the paucity of research on how policy in this area is actually created and transformed (Takanishi, 1977). There has been much more effort focused on the utilization and evaluation of existing research to provide policy guidelines (e.g., Clarke-Stewart, Note 2). While we have several good accounts on health care legislation (Redman, 1973), Title I and its legislatively mandated evaluations (McLaughlin, 1973), and Senn's (1977) oral history interviews dealing with the relationship of child development research to social policy, studies regarding family policy are conspicuously absent in current policy studies compendia (Nagel, 1977; Scribner, 1977). Rainwater and Yancey's (1967) analysis of the

Partial support for the preparation of these remarks was provided by a Spencer Fellowship from the National Academy of Education. I appreciate the suggestions of the following people on an earlier draft: Norma Deitch Feshbach, L. L. Knowles, Deborah Stipek, and Docia Zavitkovsky. The research assistance of Robert Joseph Murar is gratefully acknowledged.

politics of the Moynihan (1965) report "The Negro Family: The Case for National Action" remains one of the few attempts to examine the relationship between social science and public policy formation affecting children and families.

It is likely that studies of policy formation will enrich the field of policy studies as well as increase our sophistication about both procedural and substantive issues involved. Ultimately, they could inform effective political action on behalf of children and families. Psychologists, particularly those interested in child development, have not engaged in research on public policy formation, in part, because they have not received the required training in what can now be called a legitimate field of inquiry--policy studies. This has implications for the research training of graduate students.

The role of social scientists. Seymour Feshbach and Norma Feshbach (Note 5) strongly believe that it is the responsibility of all individuals who work with children--whether they be researchers or practitioners--to become involved in policy matters. Their call raises the dual issues of the roles social scientists can play in the policy process and of their training for these roles. Feshbach and Feshbach (Note 5) made a distinction between the role of the "expert" and the "advocate." The psychologist-as-expert is conceptualized as a technical role involving the use of his or her training to evaluate research relevant to an issue and assessing the potential effectiveness of different procedures for achieving certain goals. In contrast, the psychologist-as-advocate engages in active pursuit of programs believed to be in the interests of children. Feshbach and Feshbach (Note 5) note:

> Experts, with some unfortunate exceptions, in general, remain close to the theoretical and empirical bases for their judgments; probabilities and qualifications are attached to their statements. Advocates, while possibly remaining close to their data base, have chosen a course of action. In the expert role, the evidentiary status of a proposition is primary. In the advocacy role, the needs of children, and other groups as well, assume a higher position in the value hierarchy. (pp. 6-7)

Another participant in the symposium, Paul Dokecki (Note 4) conceptualized the role of the psychologist-as-policy-liaison-specialist, a role which he and his colleagues at the Center for the Study of Families and Children at Vanderbilt University are developing. A key aspect of this role is knowledge utilization and production in the service of policy issues. He envisions a situation in which:

> psychologists and other social scientists review, analyze, and synthesize policy-relevant research--and occasionally perform original empirical work--within the context of active and ongoing interchange with policy makers. (p. 34)

As Feshbach and Feshbach (Note 5) point out, there is dissension within the psychological rank and file regarding the role of the psychologist, on how and whether evidence can be used to inform policy matters, and indeed, there are many different positions regarding the same research studies and same policy issue. In our symposium, one point of view did not surface. A very crucial role of the scientist, in keeping with his or her training, may be to provide insight and critical appraisals of policy issues, rather than providing immediate and specific answers to certain problems, to get people in the policy-making process to reexamine the questions they are asking, the assumptions underlying their positions, and to reflect more clearly on what is happening to children and families in our society.

Training needs. Whatever role an individual chooses to play, systematic training in different policy roles is essential if we can reasonably expect individuals to perform these roles competently. Components of a training program should include the traditional ones of conceptual and methodological issues in available research and research skills. Additional components, typically not an integral part of current training, include analyses of the values and assumptions of research (Skolnick, 1976); knowledge-utilization skills for policy issues (Caplan, Morrison, & Stambaugh, 1975); studies of the policy-making and legislative processes, particularly the budgetary process; policy analysis including cost-benefit methods; and field-based experience in settings in which policy is created and implemented.

Analyses of the values and assumptions of theory and research are important because, as a number of the participants of this symposium have observed, crucial aspects of policy debates lie in the realm of social and political values, rather than in facts or scientific evidence (Bevan, Note 1; Dokecki, Note 4). Often the political determinants of policy shape what evidence will be used and how that evidence will be interpreted. An example of how policy suggestions reflect values rather than data is found in the recommendations of two prestigious groups regarding family policy (Keniston, et al., 1977; National Academy of Sciences, 1976). Arguing that institutional, macrostructural determinants are more important than compensatory educational and intervention programs for supporting child development, both groups argue for a guaranteed family income as a keystone of a national family policy. This recommendation reflects the social and political values of the individuals involved as well as a particular socio-historical context. Research on the effects of a guaranteed family income on child development is not currently available.

Since few studies are definitive, an examination of values underlying theory and research constitute an important aspect of training for policy roles. There is increasing awareness among social scientists that science is not value-neutral and independent of its socio-political context (Bower, 1977; Buss, 1975; Kuhn, 1962; Zúñiga, 1975). Courses in the sociology of knowledge, the sociology of science, and the sociology of psychological knowledge (Buss, 1975) should be an integral part of training, not only for policy roles, but for the development of a "critical" psychology.

Field-based experience, particularly at the state and local levels where policies are implemented, is a critical training ground. Such experiences tend to raise questions about the goals and assumptions of the policy as created and permit observations of its translation and implementation in the field. It is at these sites that students are exposed to the gaps between the policy and the scientific communities (Dokecki, Note 4), and the gaps among these two communities and practitioners. The rationale for field-based training in policy derives, in part, from Bevan's (Note 1) point that "the bottom line [in policy formation] is course of action" (p. 39). It is what people do and what they think they are doing in relation to policy that is important.

Examples of the ironies of policy making without knowledge of local situations are plentiful (Sarason, 1971). One will suffice. A national Child Development Associate (CDA) program was launched to give individuals working in child development centers an opportunity to demonstrate their "competency" in the classroom as an alternative to course credits and credentials. The intent was a worthy one and expressed values of equality of opportunity, and alternative routes to employment. However, the developers of the program apparently ignored state-by-state variations in licensing and credentialing child development staff. In California, where there is a highly developed system of training individuals, the CDA concept has become embroiled in efforts to cut costs and to place "in limbo" individuals with postsecondary training in child development.

Another facet of field-based training is involvement with citizens in policy planning and implementation (Hill-Scott, Note 6). The role of consumers, in this case families and their children, is one that has received token attention in the training of social scientists (Zuniga, 1975), but it is an important issue for legislators (Fraser, 1973) and realization of democratic principles of equality of respect and control. The importance of the family's role was also articulated by Coons (Note 3) who noted that in the absence of professional consensus on both goals and means for achieving them, families should be the final arbiters in decisions related to their children and family life. Thus he argued that public policy should support the family's ability to make its own decisions. In a sense, Coons (Note 3) concluded, families are the final decision makers in what they actually do with their children in the privacy of their homes.

The role of the consumer is particularly important, as Hill-Scott (Note 6) noted, in minority communities. Our recent painful experience with the compensatory early education programs in the sixties attests to how easily social science research in the form of a theory of "cultural deprivation" can be used in a degrogatory and demeaning manner reflecting dominant cultural biases and perceptions. Research should challenge existing myths rather than uncritically support them.

Furthermore, unlike other policy areas, widening the base of constituent participation is critical because the arena of children and families is something every individual has a strong opinion about and in which they can claim expertise. In this sense, family policy is unique as compared to issues of nuclear energy, national defense,

environmental pollution, space exploration, and the like, where it is generally acknowledged that expertise is confined to a few.

Field-based training is an exemplar of Sarason's (1971) imperative that in order to intervene and have a sense of the problems involved in creating change, one must first deeply understand the culture and associated regularities of the social system one is attempting to work with. Therefore, at least equally important as the placement of individuals in federal and state offices where policies are often initiated and formed, is placement in local programs in which these policies are being transformed and implemented, and where their effects on the intended beneficiaries--children and their families--can be directly experienced.

What can be done. Pressing issues remain, whether high on the "issue-attention cycle" (Downs, 1973) or not. Several participants have described how they and others have worked in the political area (Bevan, Note 1; Dokecki, Note 4; Feshbach & Feshbach, Note 5; Zavitkovsky, Note 8). Several of the psychologist panel members (Bevan, Note 1; Feshbach & Feshbach, Note 5) have identified specific ways in which psychologists can participate in the policy-making process as individuals and as members of professional associations.

These concerns are not entirely new. In 1969, the American Psychological Association, in response to social crises of the time, dedicated its annual meeting to examining the relationship between psychology and social problems (Korten, Cook, & Lacey, 1970). In retrospect, we have learned a great deal by our involvements in policy formation. Research on the policy formation process is no longer an emerging field, and training programs in child development and social policy are beginning to receive funding.

It does seem clear that the question of who shall decide has a clear answer: Those individuals and groups who make policy issues a very central, on-going concern of their lives. At the moment, "social science and child development" is an exciting and fashionable activity. But it will not remain so. What two of the symposium participants have emphasized is important: Change takes time, and engagement in the area of policy making involves a long-term commitment (Bevan, Note 1; Zavitkovsky, Note 8). According to one seasoned veteran, policy formation requires "time, patience, tolerance, knowledge, flexibility, good health, and good humor" (Zavitkovsky, 1977, p. 15).

Those who remain on the fringes of policy debates and enter into the fray now and then cannot expect to have an impact. There is also an historical lesson to be learned. Some of the early reformers who were invoived in social legislation, developed survey methods to generate data for their proposed policies (Wax, 1971). They worked on policy issues at all levels: identifying issues through living and observing in poverty and immigrant communities; determining priorities; talking with politicians; drafting the legislation; creating coalitions; experiencing the conflicts, set-backs, and political negotiations necessary; and finally, implementing policies (Takanishi, Note 7). It is this kind of involvement around issues that is important for individuals who

desire to participate in the policy arena. There are no other easy ways.

Reference Notes

1. Bevan, W. Psychologists and public policy or making the most of the Washington situation. In R. Takanishi (Chair), Public policy for children and families: Who shall decide? Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1977.

2. Clarke-Stewart, A. Child care in the family: A review of research and some propositions for policy. New York: Academic Press, in press.

3. Coons, J. E. Policies for children: How to decide who gets to decide. In R. Takanishi (Chair), Public policy for children and families: Who shall decide? Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1977.

4. Dokecki, P. R. Toward influencing those who make public policy for children and families: A liaison strategy. In R. Takanishi (Chair), Public policy for children and families: Who shall decide? Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1977.

5. Feshbach, S., & Feshbach, N. D. Public policy for children: A psychological perspective. In R. Takanishi (Chair), Public Policy for children and families: Who shall decide? Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1977.

6. Hill-Scott, K. Citizen and parent participation in policy making and program implementation. In R. Takanishi (Chair), Public Policy for children and families: Who shall decide? Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1977.

7. Takanishi, R. The legacy of Headstart: Our continuing struggle for children's rights. International Journal of Early Childhood, in press.

8. Zavitkovsky, D. Grounding policy in children's needs: A practitioner's perspective. In R. Takanishi (Chair), Public Policy for children and families: Who shall decide? Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1977.

References

Bowers, C. A. Emergent ideological characteristics of educational policy. Teachers College Record, 1977, 79, 33-54.

Buss, A. R. The emerging field of the sociology of psychological knowledge. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 988-1002.

Caplan, N., Morrison, A., & Stambaugh, R. J. The use of social science knowledge in policy decisions at the national level. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1975.

Downs, A. Up and down with ecology--the "issue-attention cycle." The Public Interest, 1973, 10, 38-50.

Fraser, D. Congress and the psychologist. American Psychologist, 1970, 25, 323-327.

Horowitz, I. (Ed.). The rise and fall of Project Camelot. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Keniston, K., & The Carnegie Council on Children. All our children: The American family under pressure. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

Korten, F. F., Cook, S. W., & Lacey, J. I. (Eds.). Psychology and the problems of society. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1970.

Kuhn, T. The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

McLaughlin, M. W. Evaluation and reform: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Title I. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1973.

Moynihan, D. P. The Negro family: The case for national action. Washington, D.C.: Department of Labor, 1965.

Nagel, S. (Ed.). Policy research studies (Vol. 1). Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1977.

National Academy of Sciences. Toward a national policy for children and families. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976.

Rainwater, L., & Yancey, W. L. The Moynihan report and the politics of controversy. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Redman, E. The dance of legislation. New York: W. W. Norton, 1973.

Sarason, S. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Senn, M. J. E. Speaking out for America's children. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1977.

Skolnick, A. (Ed.). Rethinking childhood. Perspectives on development and society. Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown, 1976.

Scribner, J. D. (Ed.). The politics of education. 76th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Takanishi, R. Federal involvement in early education (1933-1973): The need for historical perspectives. In L. G. Katz (Ed.), Current topics in early childhood education (Vol. 1). Norwood, N.J.: ABLEX, 1977.

Wax, R. Doing fieldwork. Warnings and advice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Zúñiga, R. The experimenting society and radical social reform. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 99-115.